

George T. Lister, of New York.
 Rupert A. Lloyd, of Virginia.
 Albert K. Ludy, Jr., of Arizona.
 LaRue R. Lutkins, of New York.
 James G. McCargar, of California.
 Cleveland B. McKnight, of Georgia.
 James L. O'Sullivan, of Connecticut.
 Henry L. Pitts, Jr., of New York.
 Randolph Roberts, of Virginia.
 Ralph A. Schweitzer, of California.
 Cabot Sedgwick, of Arizona.
 Richard M. Service, of California.
 Robert M. Sheehan, of the District of Columbia.

Harold Sims, of Tennessee.
 J. Ramon Solana, of North Carolina.
 Herbert D. Spivack, of New York.
 Norman C. Stines, Jr., of California.
 Weldon Litsey, of Wyoming.
 Richard E. Usher, of Wisconsin.
 Sheldon B. Vance, of Minnesota.
 Edward L. Waggoner, of Ohio.
 Harvey R. Wellman, of New York.
 George M. Widney, of Alabama.
 William A. Wieland, of New York.
 Charles H. Derry, of Georgia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consular general of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEON (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)
 Kenneth W. Chapman

SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)
 Elmer J. Herringer

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 29 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Drake Watson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.
 Benjamin Scott Whaley to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, ruler of the destinies of men and nations, Thou hast encompassed us with Thy mercies and crowned us with every blessing. Breathe upon us Thy holy presence that our lives may be worthy of the Lord and perfectly pleasing to Him, and that our labors may be in accordance with His word and His ordinance. Lead and direct us that the issues of our country may be the object of deep reflection and wise comprehension of our responsibilities.

Do Thou dispel all confusion induced by indifference and prejudice, and bless us with the freedom of the open mind and the responsive heart. When we seek Thy peace to cleanse us and heal us, it is not only a gift but a choice and an index to better strength and achievement. This day may the words of our

mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 323), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON reserved all points of order on the bill.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on tomorrow, Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in three instances and to include editorials and other material.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include the minority views filed on H. R. 2616.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a short editorial appearing in a New Jersey newspaper.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a speech on displaced persons.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include quotations from outside groups studying the operations of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. McGARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address he delivered.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter from the president of the Lost Battalion.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I may make in the Committee of the Whole today I be permitted to include certain quotations from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and from the record of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GARY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 43]

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Barden | Eberharter | Mitchell |
| Beall | Folger | Morton |
| Bell | Fuller | Nodar |
| Bland | Gallagher | Norton |
| Bolton | Gathings | Patman |
| Boykin | Gerlach | Ploeser |
| Buchanan | Gifford | Plumley |
| Buckley | Hart | Powell |
| Bulwinkle | Hartley | Schwabe, Mo. |
| Carson | Heffernan | Shafer |
| Celler | Kersten, Wis. | Short |
| Clements | Landis | Stanley |
| D'Alesandro | McMahon | Vail |
| Dawson, Ill. | McMillan, S. C. | Vinson |
| Dingell | MacKinnon | Vursell |
| Drewry | Mansfield, Tex. | West |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address delivered by Hon. Arthur Goldschmidt.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement he made with reference to H. R. 156, pending before the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and to include data he secured from the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of former prisoners of war.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he recently delivered.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New York Times magazine.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

RENT CONTROL BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 200, Rept. No. 324) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 3203, relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THIS WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I may make a brief statement regarding the program for the rest of the week. First of all, in respect to the measure now pending before the House, it has been under debate and consideration for a considerable period of time. We had hoped that it could be concluded by this

evening. I still express that hope, not that there is any desire or intention to foreclose debate, because it is a most important matter, but if it can be concluded it will materially assist us in carrying on with the program for the rest of the week and for next week.

We have scheduled for tomorrow the bill H. R. 3203, the rent-control bill. The rule on that measure has just been filed. It provides for 4 hours of general debate. Whether or not we can conclude that tomorrow I do not know, but by coming in at 10 o'clock certainly we can make very considerable progress toward its completion.

On Thursday, as we all know, we are to meet in joint session to hear the President of Mexico. In addition, we hope to dispose of the bill H. R. 2780, the temporary housing bill.

On Friday we want to dispose of the deficiency appropriation bill.

It is expected that the conference report on the portal-to-portal pay bill will be concluded this afternoon, and of course we want to dispose of that this week if we can.

Next week it is probable that there will be an appropriation bill of considerable importance, and also the Greek-Turkish loan and some other matters that will be pushing for consideration.

As I said, I have made this announcement so that the Members may know what the program is and that we may all cooperate in attempting to carry it forward as expeditiously as possible.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

APRIL 29, 1947.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the act approved May 17, 1928 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1052a), relative to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, I have designated the following members of the Armed Services Committee to serve on the Board of Visitors for the Eightieth Congress: Hon. LESLIE C. ARENS, Hon. HARRY L. TOWE, Hon. LEON H. GAVIN, Hon. WALTER NORBLAD, Hon. LANSDALE G. SASSER, Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Hon. ARTHUR WINSTEAD.

Respectfully yours,

W. G. ANDREWS,
Chairman.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, with Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending

an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] and a substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYTS]. Debate on the so-called Jonkman amendment and all amendments thereto had been fixed at 30 minutes. Of that 30 minutes, 20 minutes remain. The time was allotted to the gentlemen who had asked to be recognized, and the Chair will recognize them in the order in which their names were recorded by the Clerk.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that we can improve the bill before the House by adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]. That will give us an opportunity to save \$150,000,000. There are other amendments which in my judgment should be adopted and which will be offered as the bill is read for amendment to try to control the disposition of our relief in various countries. I am of the opinion that we have here a great opportunity to bring a little more sanity into the disposition of relief paid for by the people's money. I think if the House asserts itself and takes the action which it should, it might have some influence on what the House decides to do on the bill which will follow for \$400,000,000 which is known as the Greek-Turkish loan bill.

It seems to me, as I stated on the floor the other day, that the time has come when we must be more realistic about our approach to the problems of relief with respect to how they affect the American people.

We must stop voting blank checks against the finances and resources of our Nation. We must give greater consideration to the ability of our people to bear such large financial burdens.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday a statement was made on the floor that our Nation was continuing to ship to Soviet Russia trucks and heavy equipment. During the afternoon I propounded a question to members of the Foreign Affairs Committee with the idea of ascertaining whether or not that was true, and if it was true, just why. I did not receive a very satisfactory answer. That explains my taking the floor at this time, in the hope that some member of the Foreign Affairs Committee may explain to the House and to the country if the charges made yesterday are true, and if we are, in fact, shipping heavy equipment to Russia. I, for one, would like to know just why we are continuing to fortify communism in Soviet Russia when our foreign policy seems to be to check communism in Turkey and Greece and other parts of the world. There may be a satisfactory explanation. If there is, I think the country and the Congress is entitled to have it.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. The fact is that inquiry reveals this morning that that is not occurring. As to the reasons why

it was stopped, in the short 2 minutes, time would not be available to explain it. But suffice it to say that is not occurring at the moment.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman give an explanation at sometime during the day?

Mr. JARMAN. When opportunity presents itself, if someone else does not, I will.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman. I think the gentleman will agree that if that is being done we are following a rather inconsistent policy in fortifying communism, on the one hand, and trying to stop it, on the other.

Mr. JARMAN. And you are certainly entitled to an explanation, which can be made, but not in just a minute.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope the gentleman or some other member of the Foreign Affairs Committee will make that explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], for 2 minutes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to the substitute offered by my esteemed colleague from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. If I understand the gentleman's substitute amendment correctly, it "strikes out the Jonkman amendment." He said without those words his substitute would be meaningless. I quite agree with the gentleman. That is all his substitute does. It simply strikes out the Jonkman amendment. What does the gentleman propose to do? He says, "Give the full authorization for the \$350,000,000, then ask the Appropriations Committee to make the full appropriation of the \$350,000,000, but do not let them spend any more than JONKMAN says, \$200,000,000, until some new committee authorizes the other \$150,000,000."

Just how is that going to be accomplished? How does the gentleman expect the Appropriations Committee to give the full \$350,000,000 under those conditions?

Now, the facts are clear. I say it is for the House to act on this authorization. I told you yesterday there was no dispute about the facts. The United Nations recommends relief for the balance of 1947. Herbert Hoover recommends relief for the balance of 1947. President Truman recommends relief for the balance of 1947. Mr. Acheson recommends relief for the balance of 1947, and says no relief will be needed in 1948, except possibly—not probably—but possibly a limited amount for Austria. Mr. Clayton says the same thing. Mr. Tyler Wood says the same thing—no relief will be needed in 1948. Then, why should we appropriate for 1948?

I have shown you by the testimony of Mr. Clayton that they propose \$250,000,000 of the \$350,000,000 for 1948. Mr. Tyler Wood says the same thing. My amendment gives them the \$100,000,000 which the budget provided for 1947 and an additional \$100,000,000 of the 1948 budget allowance, all to be spent in 1947.

This will be ample and liberal for relief up to December 31, 1947.

The Vorys substitute should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this is a most serious matter that we are considering at this time. I am certainly not going to bind myself at this time to say I shall not support any amendment, but it does seem to me that the bill is a very good bill as it is written. It may be that the amount should be reduced. I am not sure as to that at this time. It seems there are safeguards and checks in this bill. The President may use his discretion in the matter and then we ourselves may use our discretion. I feel certain that the President of the United States and those whom he duly constitutes under this bill are not going to do anything to further communism. I know I would not want to do anything to further communism; but, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest something I believe would be a good thing to do? It is to ask ourselves this solemn question: What would the Master of us all do if He had the authority to take this money and feed people? Would He ask if a man were a Communist? Would He even ask if he were a criminal? As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, if able to do so I would give food to a criminal, to anyone who needed food.

I believe we will go a long way toward furthering democracy if we follow the humanitarian policy of feeding people who are hungry, when, of course, we are able to, regardless of who they are. I am telling you that I believe we will do an injury to ourselves by trying to confine this matter to an absurd extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, 2 minutes is too short a time. I expect to get additional time later in the day. I therefore yield my time now to someone else.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

DANGERS OF COMMUNISM—SOVIET SPIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, after listening to General Marshall last night, I am more convinced than ever that we can never deal with a Communist country.

I wish to call attention to the fact that on page A1895 of the Appendix of the RECORD you will find a complete statement on the Russian spy ring in Canada, the United States, and England.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] on yesterday talked about the Committee on Foreign Affairs knowing so much more on this subject than the other Members of the House. The only committee in this House, and one of the two agencies of this Government that were on the trail of these Soviet spies last year, was the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I have no time; I am sorry.

The other day we had before us Hon. W. C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to Russia. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] asked him this question:

Mr. BONNER. What do you think Russia would do with the atomic bomb?

Mr. BULLITT. If she had it and we did not it would already have been dropped on the United States.

We need not deceive ourselves, communism is a conspiracy to overthrow this Government and every other similar government in the world, and they had their spies from one end of this country to the other, in this Capitol, if you please; and this man Gouzenko, who revolted, saw what his own country was doing to civilization. He came out and repudiated it and turned over the information to the Canadian Government. He said:

Holding forth at international conferences with voluble statements about peace and security, the Soviet Government is simultaneously preparing secretly for a Third World War.

He further said:

To meet this war, the Soviet Government is creating in democratic countries, including Canada, a fifth column in the organization of which even diplomatic representatives of the Soviet Government, take part.

How can we trust such a regime? It is time for the American Congress and the American people to awake to these dangers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to urge the House to adopt House Joint Resolution 153 as reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I wish to go on record as being particularly opposed to any amendment which would make Poland ineligible for relief assistance.

Poland has been branded as a satellite of Soviet Russia, and our former Ambassador to Poland, the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane, has made the issue of Poland clear to the American people. I have followed closely the public speeches, radio broadcasts, press interviews, and so forth, made by Ambassador Lane. It is clear to everyone who listens to what this able man says that a distinction should be made between the present Government of Poland, which is controlled by Soviet Russia and run by its agents, and the people of Poland, who have never accepted this government by any of the democratic procedures.

The intent of the amendment aiming at striking Poland off the list of countries for which relief will be provided aims directly at imposing a harsh penalty upon a people who never deserted our cause and who were saddled with a government without having been asked whether or not they like it.

It is a different thing to brand a government as a satellite of Soviet Russia and a different thing to deprive the

hungry people of Poland of the relief they well deserve.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has put into House Joint Resolution 153, as presented by our chairman the gentlemen from New Jersey, the Honorable CHARLES A. EATON, on April 23 a set of conditions which will have to be met by the present Government of Poland before relief assistance is granted to the people of that country.

It is my considerate opinion that the conditions written into House Joint Resolution 153 are fully adequate for the full protection of our rights. The present Government of Poland will have to make sure that there will be no discrimination in the distribution of relief supplies; that there will be complete freedom of press reports on our relief activities; that full publicity will be given to the fact that the relief comes from the United States, and not from Soviet Russia; and that representatives of the United States Government will be permitted to supervise the distribution of food and clothing among the people.

The President of the United States will be authorized to cancel any further relief activities in Poland should the present Government of this country fail to meet its obligations.

In my opinion, the safeguarding clauses provided by House Joint Resolution 153—if met by the present Polish Government—will prevent it from any cheating on our relief program and for using it for the purpose of spreading communism.

Should we, however, deprive the Polish people of our aid and assistance, the puppet Government of Poland will once more have to turn to Russia in order to obtain at least some quantities of food for their population, and this will provide the Government of Poland with means of influencing the people of Poland, of alienating them from our ideology, and of directing the good will to Soviet Russia rather than to the United States.

I know how the people of Poland feel toward the United States. I know that they will never become our enemies, as their Government wants them to be. But why help the Communists turn these people against us, and why penalize them for their present situation, for which they are not in the least responsible?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this bill does not propose to send gold and silver to Europe, but rather to send fuel, food, clothing, medicine, and items to aid in food production. Before fixing the amount to be sent, let us look at what we have to give. We have given away our natural resources with lavish hand. The time has come to think some of America and our own future. Some time ago I asked the reference department of the Library of Congress to give me facts as to how many years our supplies will last of such natural resources as iron, iron ore, coal, copper, and so forth, what the annual rate of depletion is, and the annual loss of topsoil by cultivation and erosion. We have given our goods away just as if there were no bottom to the barrel, and as though our natural re-

sources were as unlimited as eternity itself. But this is not the case. On the contrary, the time is fast approaching when ours will be a have-not nation, in respect to some of the most vital and essential natural resources, and will have a shortage of others. This report from the Library of Congress states, for instance, that at the rate of use in the year 1944 our supply of high-grade iron ore will be exhausted in approximately 49 years, and that the rate of depletion is 2 percent per annum, which is greater than it was 10 years ago; that at the rate of use in 1946 our proved reserve of crude petroleum oil, unless new fields are discovered, will be exhausted in 12½ years. If new fields are discovered, they will, of course, add to our proved oil reserve. But the rate of discovery of new fields is decreasing, and, of course, discovery of new fields will cease entirely some time.

The reports of high-grade commercial iron ore is that at the rate of depletion and consumption as of 1944, our known supply will be entirely consumed in 49 years. The rate of depletion is increasing today. These figures do not include submarginal fields.

On copper, as of 1946, the rate of consumption or depletion is 2.7 percent per annum, and at that rate, the known supply as of 1946 would last only 37.2 years. These figures do not include submarginal supplies.

Because of erosion, approximately half a million acres of cultivated land are going out of production each year.

I cannot, of course, in 2 minutes, go into a detailed discussion of this very important report. I expect to insert the entire report in the RECORD within the next few days, but these facts need to be considered in connection with this bill to give away \$350,000,000 worth of our products. So far as our generosity is concerned, the green light is changing to red. Not only for the benefit of generations far into the future—not only for the benefit of that generation composed of our own sons and daughters, but for the benefit of our own generation, you and me, we must begin to conserve our resources.

I believe this bill should be cut from \$350,000,000 to \$200,000,000. I further believe that this bill should name not only the commission to distribute the relief materials, but should also name the terms and conditions of distribution, and these terms and conditions should be such as to encourage these European nations to take over the task of feeding, clothing, and caring for themselves at the earliest possible moment and to cease looking to us for their upkeep.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] for 5 minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly to be in opposition to the two distinguished members of my committee, but I am constrained to oppose and vote against the Jonkman amendment and the Vorys substitute therefor, and I do this as a matter of arithmetic largely. We have about 35,000,000 people who are in starvation, disease, and despair. We have \$350,000,000 suggested in this legislation for their relief. That is \$10 apiece. The Jonkman amendment

cuts it down to \$6. We might just as well do nothing. That is my reason for voting against the amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Reference has been made here today to General Marshall's report last night on the Moscow Conference. I am sure all of us are grateful to him and proud of the way in which he conducted our affairs there, his patient courtesy coupled with firm adherence to principles, his refusal to yield to the pressures that have wrecked so many previous conferences. Today there are millions of people in Europe who love freedom and hate communism worse than anybody here possibly can. Our behavior at Moscow gave them their first ray of hope in months. What will happen to their new-born hope if they find that the very first action taken by the American Congress after the Moscow Conference is to cut drastically the \$350,000,000 proposed to help keep these millions alive while they struggle to overthrow the tyrannies under which they suffer? The money is authorized—it will be appropriated and spent only when need is demonstrated as it comes along. Will it not, in the gentleman's judgment, be disastrous to their hopes and ours and an undermining of General Marshall's work to take this action today?

Mr. EATON. It would be. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I have a brief statement here settling the confusion over the dates 1947 and 1948 which I would like to send to the desk and, if time permits, have the Clerk read. I do this for the enlightenment and benefit of all of us.

The Clerk read as follows:

In connection with the question of whether \$350,000,000 is needed for relief in 1947, the following information should be considered.

The report of the United Nations Technical Committee on Post-UNRRA Relief Needs found a total relief need of \$583,000,000 for European countries in the calendar year 1947, exclusive of remaining UNRRA shipments. This figure did not cover any possible needs of China. The Department of State estimated the needs for Europe plus China at a total of \$610,000,000. This estimate is also for the calendar year 1947 exclusive of remaining UNRRA shipments. (See Mr. Clayton's statement of page 2 of the committee hearings under the heading "Relief needs in 1947.")

The President requested \$350,000,000 as the United States contribution to help meet the above needs. The President in his message of February 24, requesting the appropriation, said, "The authorization recommended is designed for the urgent relief needs for the balance of the year. The most critical period will be in the spring and summer months, when UNRRA shipments will cease and the harvests are not yet available." He must have been referring to the calendar year rather than the fiscal year, since it is clear that he did not intend to spend \$350,000,000 before June 30, 1947, which is the end of the fiscal year.

The budget indicated an estimated expenditure of \$100,000,000 in the fiscal year 1947, that is, prior to June 30, 1947, and \$250,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948. This was to cover the program of shipments from the period July 1 to the 31st of December 1947,

plus small possible slip-overs in the first month or two of the calendar year 1948. This is clear from the letter of the Acting Secretary of State. He said, "The amount requested is to assist in meeting the estimated relief needs for the calendar year 1947. In the actual operation of the program some shipments may slip over into the first few months of 1948. With the possible exception of Austria we do not anticipate that further relief will be necessary unless disastrous crop failures or other unforeseen events occur."

Dr. Fitzgerald, Secretary-General of the International Emergency Food Council and food adviser to former President Hoover, agreed that a total of \$296,000,000 would be needed from the United States in the calendar year 1947 for food alone for the European countries excluding seeds, fertilizer, medical supplies and the other items in the bill and excluding any possible needs of China. (See bottom of p. 108 of the committee hearings.)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, do I correctly understand the parliamentary situation to be that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] has an amendment pending before the Committee by which he would reduce the appropriation to the extent of \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has a substitute amendment pending whereby he would authorize the full \$350,000,000 but delegate the authority to the Administrator to take a look at it later on and see whether we shall spend the \$150,000,000?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Vorys amendment and the Jonkman amendment be again reported so that we may all be familiar with them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendments as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: On page 1, line 4, after "not to exceed", strike out "\$350,000,000" and insert "\$200,000,000."

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS as a substitute for the Jonkman amendment: Strike out the Jonkman amendment and at the end of section 1 add the following: "there is hereby established a Joint Committee on International Relief consisting of five Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore and five Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker."

"It shall be the duty of the joint committee to study relief needs in foreign countries and the ability of the United States to furnish relief; the President shall keep the joint committee advised of foreign relief needs and the measures he is taking to relieve such needs and all expenditures in excess of \$200,000,000 from the appropriations herein authorized shall have the approval of the joint committee. Such approval may be given in detail or in gross amounts as the joint committee shall deem advisable."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS) there were—ayes 29, noes 132.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONKMAN) there were—ayes 130, noes 117.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. EATON and Mr. JONKMAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 156, noes 138.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 1, at the end of section 1, add the following:

"Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Italy, Poland, Hungary, and China: *Provided*, That the President if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other countries, is authorized to utilize not more than \$15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other country or countries."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to designate the countries where the money shall be spent; and in addition it provides further that \$15,000,000 shall be used in those areas where the State Department determines aid is necessary.

If this Congress wants to get away from the idea of writing blank checks then the Members of this House should support this amendment because it is a mandate to the Department that it shall spend the money in these countries named except with the \$15,000,000.

I know the argument will be advanced that Poland and Hungary are Communist-dominated. It seems to me in the light of the heroic struggle that the Polish people have made down through the centuries that we can afford to take a chance to see that these people are given the opportunity to benefit under this legislation. Poland, in all of its history, has never yielded to those who have overrun it. I believe that the spirit of freedom is more intense in Poland than it is in our own country. We are taking a chance; but it seems to me it puts it right up to the administrators. A contract will be made with the existing Polish Government for the handling of this relief. If the State Department is satisfied that the great bulk of the Polish people will not benefit, then by all means it should not enter into such an agreement; but it is an administrative matter. We cannot this afternoon afford to have word get back to these gallant Polish people that we have failed to recognize their need even though they are overrun by the Communists.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentleman whether or not his amendment will in

any way interfere with those provisions that are in the bill as proposed which require free access to the press and radio in those countries and even though free access is denied would the effect of the gentleman's amendment be to compel the furnishing of relief?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; in my opinion, no.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the House to understand that as the bill stands now, Poland would be excepted from the benefits of this legislation? I do not so understand.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; that is not the case.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is the \$15,000,000 a part of the \$200,000,000?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes; that is right.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it specifically says that relief shall be given to these countries but no mention is made as to what amount shall be given to each one of the countries mentioned by the gentleman?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman puts that in there to be sure that the thought expressed in the report is put in the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is it exactly.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I am thoroughly in accord with what the gentleman has said and I believe the committee should accept the amendment.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHADWICK. Will the gentleman advise us why Czechoslovakia is not included in the list of governments named? I think I know the reason and I believe it reflects credit on Czechoslovakia rather than otherwise but, in my opinion, it would be desirable to have the statement in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is my understanding that there is not the need that is contemplated by this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder what good purpose it can serve to delegate any part of these funds to any one of the countries named. The Administrator can do identically the same thing without the language of the gentleman's amendment by simply giving a very small token amount to any one of the countries named if he had no intention of giving it to them under the language of the bill as written.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is purely an administrative matter. In offering the amendment I want to see that these countries who are in such great need are benefited. It is entirely possible administratively that this money might be spread over any number of additional countries and we might, as a matter of fact, spend some of it in the Ukraine.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman state categorically and emphatically whether or not in his opinion the language which is in the bill before the House will permit part of the \$200,000,000, as it now stands, to be used for Poland, Austria, and these other countries?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, indeed; and it will go further than that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me say that I am opposed to the bill and I will vote against the bill if it does that very thing.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Answering the gentleman's question, may I say that in the bill itself there is no specific mention of any amount to any particular country. There is nothing in the bill to that effect and I think that answers the gentleman. The total amount authorized under this bill can be distributed any place in any of these countries that the organization or the Administrator feels so disposed to spend it in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the distinguished gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, if under the bill, as written, and the State Department so decided, it could allocate money out of this \$200,000,000 for the relief of Russia or any other country?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It could; yes, indeed.

Mr. KEEFE. If the amendment of the gentleman is adopted, as I understand it,

he is pinning it down so that no part of this money can be used for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Exactly so. That is the import of the amendment.

Mr. JUDD. It is a restrictive amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. By designating the countries in which the money is to be spent, may I ask does that obligate the State Department to spend the money in all those countries or could the State Department just select two of them?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes. It is an administrative matter. They are under the legislation presumed to make a contract with these countries that are to get relief.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. There is nothing in the amendment and there is nothing in the bill thus far that would protect the people of America and our Government against these funds falling into the hands of those people that we are opposing today, the Communists, who dominate the governments of many of the countries.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Well, I think we can do it. I think this amendment takes care of it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. How does this amendment take care of or protect us against these funds getting into the hands of the Communists and their friends?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We certainly should assume that the State Department is not going to make that kind of an agreement.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Do not the provisions in sections 3, 4, and 5 of the bill make it impossible that it could fall into the Communist hands and could be used by Communists alone? There are restrictions in the bill to take care of that, and the gentleman's amendment prevents any of these funds from going to Yugoslavia and to Russia; is that not true?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right, as I understand it.

Mr. VORYS. Is this not also true, that the gentleman's amendment contains this language: "This provision shall not imply any obligations to give relief to any of the countries mentioned," so that it does not create any obligation to any country?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand the language of the gentleman's amendment it, in a sense, allocates this money to Austria, Hungary, China, Poland, Italy, and Greece, so that it cuts out Russia and it cuts out Yugoslavia.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. It goes to free people, the people who desire to be free in Austria, Hungary, Greece, Poland, and China, that we are undertaking to help.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. KNUTSON. Not Poland.

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; Poland is in there.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We are taking a chance on Poland and Hungary, and I hope that it will work out administratively.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLMER, for the Smith of Wisconsin amendment: On page 1, after line 8, add a new sentence as follows:

"Provided, That none of the funds authorized to be appropriated herein shall be expended in or used for such relief assistance in those countries whose governments are dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I confess that I offered this amendment only after long, conscientious and thoughtful deliberation. But we might just as well recognize that we have reached the crossroads in our foreign policy. We had just as well recognize now as later that we are embarking upon the most important change in our foreign policy in the history of this country.

We have started out to do what? Fight communism. Now, let us not get away from the objective. We are going to oppose communism. If we are going to oppose communism, then we must oppose it on all fronts. We must be coldly realistic in the approach to this problem. We say that we are going to furnish \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey to combat communism—and we are doing that openly; we had just as well be frank about it. We are going to furnish the Greeks and Turks \$400,000,000 to be used by them, and as an incentive to them to keep communism from taking over their governments. But how are we going to do that on one hand and then turn around on the other and say that we are going to be the big brother and we are going to help everybody? We have to be coldly realistic. God knows I have sympathy with the starving people who are under the domination of the Soviet Republic. I have been over there; I saw them suffering. Of course they are suffering over there, all throughout Europe. But the point that I am trying to drive home here to you today is that if you are going to fight communism you have to fight it with its own weapons. You have to be coldly realistic, I repeat.

If we are going to say to the people of Greece and Turkey, "We are going to give you \$400,000,000 to stop the inroads and the encroachment of communism here," and then we are going to say to those poor, oppressed people in the countries that are under the domination of Russia, "We are going to help you, too," what incentive is there going to be for them to try to get out from under the heel of oppression?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman tell us who is to make the decision as to what country is a Communist-dominated country?

Mr. COLMER. I am sure the gentleman knows the answer to that question: The same sources would make that determination as would make it under his amendment, that is, it would be up to the administration to make that decision.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my distinguished friend, who always speaks for the Polish people and speaks with reason.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman's amendment actually proposes that the Polish people shall be given starvation, and thereby we are going to win them from communism. That is the gentleman's logic and his reasoning, as I get it. I cannot understand that reasoning and logic that he is proposing here today. Certainly those people do not want communism any more than the gentleman does. They have had a government put upon them that they did not want. But the gentleman says to those people, "You must have a revolution first in your country before we will give you any aid." Is not that his logic? How are those people going to have a revolution in the condition they are in now, when they are starved and sick and hungry? A man cannot fight communism, cannot fight Russia, in the position he is in in Poland today. But they have fought communism as no other nation has throughout the years. They fought for liberty throughout the centuries, and they have always won. They will fight again. But make them strong, give them physical strength to fight. You cannot expect dead Poles to fight communism.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman has asked me a number of questions all wrapped up in one. I said in the beginning, and I have great sympathy for the gentleman's viewpoint, that we have to be coldly realistic in this thing. We have to face this issue as it is, not as we would like to have it. Yes, I have sympathy with those people, but I repeat that if you are going to treat all peoples alike there is going to be no incentive for them either to stay out

from under the heel of oppression or for those who are already under the heel of oppression to get out.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. In answer to the question asked by the gentleman on the other side, I believe the gentleman said that the way you determine whether these countries are under Soviet domination can be done by the administration. Has the gentleman thought of the fact that we recognize these countries and that their ambassadors are here? Can you see the position that we would be in if we say, "We are not going to recognize you on this thing because we claim that you are under Soviet domination?" How are you going to get around the fact that they are recognized diplomatically?

Mr. COLMER. Somebody along the line must determine this. Do not forget that somewhere down the line there is a limit to the point to which this country can go to feed the world. If we are going to fight communism, we must fight it. As I said in the beginning, I do not like this sort of thing, either.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say in reply to the gentleman from New York that these countries had their ambassadors here while they had a spy ring working in this country, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I said in the beginning that I had given some thought and study to this matter. I do not have to apologize for that. I think most of the Members of the House know of the study that the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning made and they know its recommendations and how those recommendations are now unfolding in the light of present developments. To implement those recommendations, on March 24 I introduced a resolution that would do a number of things. Generally, it would advise the President of the United States and the Congress what should be the policy of the United States in this great crisis in the world. Among the provisions of that resolution is one that would deny economic aid and assistance to the Soviet Republic and to those countries under the domination of the Soviet Republic. We hope to have hearings on that resolution before too long. We must face this issue as it is. My amendment is consistent with that resolution and it is consistent with the Truman doctrine.

In our factories in this country today we have representatives of the Soviet Republic who are there as supervisors and as inspectors to see that the machinery that the Soviet Republic is get-

ting from this country is according to order. They have hundreds of them. How many do you think we have in the Russian factories over there? We are today making the same mistakes in our foreign policy that we did prior to Pearl Harbor when we were shipping oil, scrap iron, and all those things that were necessary to build the sinews of war to Japan.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield briefly to my friend.

Mr. CHELF. I think the mistake was just made when the House voted 150 to 138 to yank the rug out from under Secretary Marshall in refusing to give \$350,000,000 to the Truman program for aid to Europe. When we cut the sum to \$200,000,000 we seriously hurt our foreign policy and our defense against the spread of communism was badly weakened. It has cost the United States over \$250,000,000,000 and over a million casualties in flesh and blood to win the war, and now we are being niggardly in providing sufficient funds to sponsor and preserve the peace. Why spend so much to win the peace and then literally toss it away once it is in our grasp? Russia wants a hungry Europe, because an empty stomach is far more receptive to communism.

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the views of my distinguished friend from Kentucky. His views are always worthy of consideration, but the point of the matter is that this Nation is burdened with the greatest national debt that any country has ever accrued. There is a limitation even to the resources of this great Nation. We do not know where this policy that we are embarking on is going to lead us. There is a bottom in the Nation's meal barrel as verily as there is in the individual's barrel. We cannot help everybody, and sometimes I doubt whether in the final analysis we get much good will that way.

But be all of that as it may, we are all interested as a Christian people in trying to help our less fortunate brethren. But what assurance can we possibly have in the light of our knowledge of the Russian system that any substantial amount of this money sent into those governments which are dominated by Russia will ever reach the objective which we have in mind, namely—the starving people of those countries? We are told that there are safeguards of inspection and publicity, and so forth, in this bill to insure that objective, but I point out to you that everyone who knows anything about the Russian system knows that these governments in the dominated countries are nothing but puppets—the creation of Russia. Is it reasonable to assume that money, foods, fertilizer or machinery turned over to those puppets of Russia would be delivered to these starving people or reach them? And bear you in mind that under the provisions of this bill that is what is proposed to be done. From my knowledge of that situation over there no one can convince me that this relief turned over to these governments cannot and will not be diverted from the channels through which they are expected to flow to these starving peoples.

Can anyone argue successfully for a moment that a carload of fertilizer, for instance, which is turned over to one of those puppet governments cannot be diverted even though we have a handful of representatives on the ground?

Mr. Chairman, I fear that the game is not worth the candle, and personally I cannot go along with that line of reasoning, especially when I know it to be a fact that Russia has already stripped many of these countries of much of the assistance which they now so badly need and which under this bill we would propose to turn over to them to be delivered to these people.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have waited a long time for an opportunity to speak on this bill. Before I give my words I would like first to present my credentials.

I am not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I have never made any Government junket, flying over Rome and posing as an authority on Italy, or flying over Poland and posing as an authority on Poland; but I do know something about European affairs.

To give you the meat of my background, I am not one of those that switches with the breeze. I will refer you now to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 12, 1945, when the crime of Yalta was announced to the world. It was almost treason for anyone to say anything against that crime at Yalta. I did, and I was accused of preaching treason. I refer to the RECORD. That is more than 2 years ago. It is written in the RECORD, so I am not patting myself on the back, and do not interpret it as such, please. But here we have a statement from a distinguished Member of this House, and similar statements were made in the Senate:

Mr. Speaker, no conference of the allies in this war previous to that historic meeting just completed on the Crimea has had greater significance. It was a defense destined to lay the foundation of the world of tomorrow. The results of the conference are better than the most optimistic expectations. They are better because they are based on a truly growing confidence among the Allied Governments. They breathe sincerity and strength. Each great power made concessions. They were based on the American concept of conciliation of different points of view, and not based on a single opinion.

That is the opinion that was expressed in the House. That is the opinion that was expressed in the Senate. That is the opinion expressed by radio commentators, by newspapers, by the State Department, and by the OWI.

I took the hard fight and the uphill fight. In a 1-hour speech that day I concluded my remarks by saying:

Mr. Chairman, just as these words about Munich are today the laughing stock of the world, just as the praise which was sung of Mr. Chamberlain has now become the laughing stock of the world, just so the words of praise that are being sung about the crime of Yalta will likewise become some day the laughing stock of the world.

That is more than 2 years ago. I want to tell you why I think I am qualified to talk on this subject. Since that

time I have given many speeches. They have been reprinted all over the world. Here is a copy of a speech I made in this Congress, reprinted by the Polish underground in Italy. Here is another one reprinted by the Polish underground in France. It was reprinted by the Polish underground in England, carrying my words of advice, that the day would come when we would regret the sell-out of Poland at Yalta.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. By the "Polish underground" the gentleman means the anti-Communist Polish underground?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes; definitely.

Then, on May 3, 1945, that is, almost 2 years ago, I gave a speech on the floor of this House, of which more than 500,000 copies were ordered and distributed throughout the country, wherein I said that the Government of the United States of America is making a mistake; that we are making the Russians so strong and communism so strong that eventually we are going to have trouble with them like we had trouble with Hitler and trouble with Japan because we made them too strong.

May 24, 1945, a speech in the RECORD, "Trouble With Tito; We Asked for It."

Two years ago I told you we were going to have trouble with Tito in Yugoslavia; that we should not give him any money or food or anything that would make him strong.

"Lithuania Under Red Fascism," in 1945 I told you what was going on in Lithuania.

I took every one of those countries, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia. In addition, Mr. Chairman, in the last 2 years I have talked in every city of any consequence in this Nation. Talked to whom? To Americans of Polish descent, of Serbian descent, of Slovakian descent, of Finnish descent, all of them who have relatives in those countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes to tell my story.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I am not at all sure that I will object—if the debate is to be very limited on this, I shall have to object, because there are those here who desire to plead the cause of the American taxpayers and bond buyers, and we will expect some time on this subject also.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, cannot give the gentleman the answer to his question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I serve notice that if necessary, I shall object to any extension of time unless the chairman of the committee assures the House that he will not move to shut off debate. We should have time to debate this question as to whether or not we are going to send funds to the agencies of Russia on the one hand to support Russia and send funds to the enemies of Russia on the other hand.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not lie within the province of the Chairman to decide. The Committee itself will decide that.

The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I object.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin be extended for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for five additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the membership for being so very generous with me.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a most tragic dilemma right now. We are confronted with the question of stopping Moscow. We want to help poor and starving people, yet we are in a dilemma whereby in attempting to help those poor and starving people we will be forced also to help communism. There is no way out of it. Let us take the unfortunate situation of Poland. The people of Poland have a government that is not the will of the Polish people. The people of Poland have a government, Mr. Chairman, that was forced upon them by the Government of the United States of America as one of the Big Three powers. The Government of Poland today was thrust upon the Polish people. The Polish people were not even consulted. The Polish people were not even invited to Yalta. The Polish Army that was fighting the enemy all over the world was not even given the consideration of once being asked for a word of advice. Three holler-than-thou men went over to Yalta and set up the Polish Government.

The leader of the Polish Government today is not even a citizen of Poland. He has been a citizen of the Soviet Union ever since 1921, and the Polish people still do not recognize that as their government. But the Government of the United States of America does recognize that as the Polish Government. So we are out to punish those people for a government which the Polish people do not want but a government which the United States of America forced upon them and a government which the Government of the United States recognizes. So that is the dilemma in which we find ourselves.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. And the ratio of nominal Communists in Poland is less than 1 to 30 anti-Communists. Is that correct in the gentleman's estimation?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes. If war ever breaks out between the United States and Russia, just as Poland was the first country with courage enough to stand up and fight Hitler you will find the Polish people fighting alongside the Gov-

ernment of the United States of America; you will have the Poles alongside the United States of America sooner than you will have the people of Italy. They will go like they went in all the other wars, to the side with the more opportune chance of winning the war perhaps, they will go where they can get fat like they got fat in this war, and likewise a lot of other countries I could name. You have more Communists in Italy today, real honest to God Communists who are sold on the cause of communism, than you will ever have in Poland.

I received a letter the other day from a man who left the force, the anti-Communist underground of Poland. He says he is leaving the force to join his family in Warsaw. In that letter he said to me:

We are not giving up the fight against communism, but I am tired of starving in the force; so I am going to eat and live until the opportunity arises when we can get help from the outside and when the world wakes up that communism is dangerous and the world will set itself up to destroy communism. When that time comes we will again march into the forests and we will first fight communism.

I wish I had time to show you how many Communists have been killed in Poland by these men who are fighting in the forests. That is the reason I asked for 15 additional minutes to give you the names of these men who fight communism, the torture they go through, the concentration camps they are sent to and the punishment they receive. They are fighting communism now and approximately 10 Communist agents a day are being slaughtered by the Polish underground.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman then, I take it, is definitely against the Colmer amendment?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am against the Colmer amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended 10 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I never did want to impose myself upon the patience of anyone who does not care to listen to me. If I had the time I could tell you and the gentleman who objects a darn sight more about what is going on in Europe than the State Department can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi, the author of the proposed amendment, in his statement that the United States has at last been forced to take a stand against communism, but from that point on I cannot agree with him. It is my idea, it is my conviction, that this amendment will further the cause of communism,

rather than retard that iniquitous movement.

Mr. Chairman, what nations is this amendment aimed at? Only two nations—Poland and Hungary. There is little that I can add to what has been said about the glorious history of Poland. Why should Poland be denied this relief? Why should her people be left to starve? For six centuries Poland has been in a political nut-cracker and, at one time or another, has been dominated by France, Germany or Russia; but she has always struggled for her freedom. Poland's sons fought for liberty in this country and in other sections of the world even when they could not win liberty for themselves. Remember this, Poland will yet be free again.

How about the starving people of this other little nation—Hungary? It is true that Hungary was first overrun by Hitler and is now dominated by Stalin, but the Hungarian people are a good liberty-loving people.

What steps did they take to retain their liberty and the democratic form of government while some of the other nations of Europe were bowing to Stalin? Hungary is the only nation in Europe that has voted for a democracy like ours while dominated by Russian troops. They did that when Russian troops were watching their election. They voted for the Small Land Owners Party, which is about the same as the Democratic Party or the Republican Party in this country, if you please; and they have constantly refused, under great pressure from Russia, to deviate from the democratic ideal.

Now, we refuse by this amendment to give bread and meat to the people of Hungary and to the people of Poland when we know that we are going to feed our erstwhile enemies, the people of Germany and Italy. What a travesty on justice. Why do we have to feed the Germans? For European and world stability, they say. If that is true we certainly have to feed the starving Hungarians and the Poles from the standpoint of world stability, if not for humanitarian reasons.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi and to the gentleman from Georgia that it has not been so very long since their States were dominated by an outside power, but the spirit of those people never died and they came out from under it. Why? Because they had faith in themselves. If you will show a little faith in Poland and Hungary, the only nations affected by this amendment, I believe the day will come when your action will be vindicated.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My amendment will take care of that situation, will it not?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman knows that the Poles are dominated by a criminal dictatorship that they despise. Now,

why has not the Committee on Foreign Affairs brought in a resolution to break off relations and stop recognizing an alien regime that is lording it over the Polish people?

Mr. RICHARDS. I admit that the Poles are dominated by Russia as they have been dominated down through history on different occasions by Germany, by Russia, and by France.

Mr. RANKIN. Then why should we recognize that kind of a regime?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is water over the dam, but I should add that the question of recognition of a foreign power is not decided by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. That water is still behind the dam.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am not here talking about diplomacy and why nations are recognized by other nations. I am talking about the plight of a great people; that is what I am talking about. I believe that if we are going to feed people anywhere we should feed them in Poland and Hungary.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Colmer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments as they have come on the floor of this House yesterday and today with respect to the question of the countries which are Communist-dominated, and I assume that there are Members here who feel that we are going in one direction in one place and that if we provide this relief to Poland and Hungary we will be going in another direction in another place.

Furthermore, the argument has been advanced that we must be coldly realistic, and I assume that means that we must not think of this as a matter of humanitarianism and charity but as a question of major strategy. That is the light in which I should like to discuss it.

If we vote this relief to Poland and Hungary, we are not going in the opposite direction from the direction we are traveling in Greece and Turkey. We are going in the same direction. We are going in the same direction because we know that when people are starving and destitute they are more likely to accept the Communist philosophy than if they are not.

There is a safeguard in this bill which I am afraid has not been mentioned enough, and that is on page 5, section 5 (b), which provides:

Relief assistance to the people of any country, under this joint resolution, shall, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution to the two Houses of the Congress.

There is no reason why, if we find that this relief is in fact going to help the Communist governments of these countries, we cannot withdraw it. But we should not be defeatist about this and say that we are incapable of providing this relief to those who need it, to those who are starving. Therefore, it seems to me that the amendment to take the Communist-dominated countries out of the relief bill is based on a fundamental misconception and is dangerous not only

for our national security but for the maintenance of world peace.

If this amendment is adopted, no relief would go to Poland and Hungary. Since no Austrian treaty has been negotiated and since part of Austria is now under Soviet domination, I assume that that part of Austria would also be excluded.

There is also a large part of China which under this amendment would receive no relief.

With respect to Poland, the adoption of this amendment would, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] has indicated, constitute a sort of double betrayal. We betrayed Poland at Yalta, and we shall be compounding this crime if we now deprive her of relief.

There are several safeguards in the bill, as I have tried to indicate, which would entitle the President of the United States to terminate relief if he found that it was not going to the needy but was in fact being used for political purposes by the Communists.

I am as desirous as anyone to adopt a uniform and determined policy with respect to our foreign affairs, and I am unalterably opposed to the Communist philosophy. It has always been my settled conviction that we cannot and must not attempt to go in two directions at the same time. We must not support communism while we are attempting to oppose it. I believe, however, that we will be spreading our own gospel of freedom by bringing relief to the needy in Poland and Hungary, and this is especially true in view of the provisions in the bill which require full publicity as to the source of the relief.

Let us not, I plead with you, by hasty and ill-considered action throw millions of freedom-loving and hungry Poles into the uncharitable arms of the Communists. Let us instead give them hope, help them to revive, and indicate to them that we are prepared and determined to salvage from this troubled world the blood-soaked principles for which we fought a successful war.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and the substitute amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 122, noes 23.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time is to be divided? I would like some opportunity to address myself to the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must divide the time equally among those seeking recognition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the great number of people who suddenly desire to speak on this question, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended to 40 minutes instead of 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota, to the Colmer substitute: Strike out period at end of Colmer substitute amendment and add the following provision: "Unless the governments of the countries covered by this amendment agree to the following regulations which are hereby declared to be applicable to every country receiving aid under this act.

"The State Department shall establish and maintain out of the funds herein authorized for appropriation, a relief distribution mission for each of the countries receiving aid under this act. This relief distribution mission shall be comprised solely of American citizens who shall have been approved as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These missions shall have direct supervision and control of relief supplies in each country and when it is deemed desirable by the American authorities administering the provisions of this act these relief missions shall be empowered to retain possession of these supplies up to the city or local community where our relief supplies are actually made available to the ultimate consumers."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will give me very close attention because this is an attempt to do something for the people of Hungary and the people of Poland. It is an effort to make sure this relief bill really provides relief for needy people rather than for greedy politicians.

We are faced here with a dilemma today as to whether or not the people of Hungary and Poland will be denied relief by adoption of the Colmer amendment, thus doing it by congressional action, which I think is wrong, or whether to deny the people of Hungary and Poland relief by giving relief to the Governments of those countries which are communistically dominated so that it will still not go to the needy of those countries. My amendment provides a device and procedure whereby the Congress can make this relief available to the people of Hungary and Poland as well as other war-devastated countries, and keeps it under the control of the American Relief Commission so that it is not distributed by Communists but by Americans who have been cleared by the FBI so we know it is delivered without regard to party politics or creed.

I hope you will adopt this amendment to the Colmer substitute. It was offered in the committee and was defeated by one vote. I think it is an amendment which strengthens and tightens up the whole relief distribution set-up in all countries, because it means that America gets credit for the relief we are making available. It means we are engaging, if you please, in helping the people of Poland and Hungary and other countries behind the iron curtain to learn about

the generosity of America through actually participating in its dividends.

The big weakness of UNRRA remains in the relief bill now before you unless we adopt this amendment. That weakness was this: We failed to follow the relief any further than the central governments of the countries. This bill has the same deficiency. You know and I know if you give this relief to the central government of Warsaw or the central government of Budapest it will be distributed for political purposes—to aid and fatten and strengthen the Communists.

My amendment says that when it is deemed necessary by the American authorities which will very likely be in those countries described in the Colmer proposal, which my amendment modifies and amplifies, we are empowered to follow that relief clear down to the local community. This means it will be distributed by Americans, operating as such, recognized as such, and it will be made available to the people rather than to the political agencies of those countries. If you actually want to help the hungry people of Poland and Hungary, as I do; if you want to make this relief available without regard to politics or creed, as I do; if you want to get a dollar's worth of relief for a dollar expended, as I do, my amendment plugs up the big sinkhole that Congress left in UNRRA, which was to give the money to the central government, along with a set of instructions, and exact promises which the Communists did not keep, and then let them handle the relief distribution which big-hearted Americans financed. My proposal empowers us to follow the relief program all the way through.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman's amendment provide who shall appoint this commission?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. It shall be appointed by the authority administering this act, which, I suppose, will be the relief administrator, approved by the United States Senate, as we have an amendment from the Republican side of the Foreign Affairs Committee to create such a relief administrator.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It would also provide for the American people, who furnish the dollars, a genuine accounting, under American citizenship and leadership?

Mr. MUNDT. That is absolutely right, and it will not permit the governments of Budapest or Warsaw to claim that we are denying relief to their people. We are making it available to them on our terms, and we are pointing out that these terms will be the same as we are setting up for every other country eligible for this relief. My amendment puts an end to appeasement in relief just as the State Department and the White House are at long last recognizing that the time has come to put an end to appeasement in international negotiations and international policies with Communist countries.

Mr. Chairman, Poland and Hungary can obtain relief under the Colmer

amendment as modified and redefined by the language of my amendment. But my amendment assures that this relief will go to the God-fearing, freedom-loving, independent people of Poland and Hungary and not just those who support the Communist regimes in those countries. It makes such guaranty effective and definite, since it empowers the United States to send relief missions right up to the terminal points of relief distribution. No longer can the central Communist governments of those countries short-circuit American relief and direct it to Communists only. My amendment will stop that type of perversion of American generosity for all time to come. My amendment makes this relief bill one which will feed the defenders of freedom who are hungry with the same generosity that it feeds the apostles of communism.

It will feed hungry people, Mr. Chairman, rather than the political creeds of hatred. And it will authorize American relief missions comprised of sturdy American citizens screened by our Federal Bureau of Investigation to make the on-the-spot distribution of relief required in certain circumstances to be positive that those who receive American relief know that it is American relief and not Communist aid from Russia. It will also make certain that American relief is used to maintain life in needy areas without regard for creed, color, or nationality rather than being used as UNRRA so frequently was to maintain in power a political clique of godless Communists who have imposed themselves upon the long-suffering people of such countries as Poland and Hungary. I urge support for my amendment to the Colmer amendment and then for the Colmer amendment as rewritten by the Mundt amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] for 3 minutes.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call attention to the fact that away back in 1943 when an appropriation was being made for OWI and OSS, I stood on this floor to deny them that appropriation. I then attempted to prove to the House that OWI was dominated by Communists and they were selling Russia to Europe and to the small countries, instead of selling Uncle Sam who was producing this money. That is why we have all this trouble today. Who sold out those countries? It was our Government.

That is why if you deny relief to these little countries today that 10 or 15 years from today Russia will not be a country of 180,000,000 people, but a country of 350,000,000. Then if war comes where are we? I say we should give relief but give it in a proper way under our terms where we distribute it to the people and can tell them that it is coming from Uncle Sam, that we love them.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I hope, then, I may have the gentleman's support of my amendment, because it does exactly what the gentleman has so eloquently enunciated.

Mr. LESINSKI. If we are going to distribute food there is only one way to do it, that is it should be handled by our Army, or military officials, in cooperation with our own welfare organizations in the field, and we have plenty of them, the Jewish Welfare, the YMCA, the Salvation Army, the Catholic Relief organization. They can put people over there and distribute it in a better manner.

Mr. MUNDT. This provides for distribution by American personnel.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman understands, of course, that under the bill that is not done, but the money is turned over to the government in control.

Mr. LESINSKI. We want to turn no money over to any government; we want to feed the people ourselves. Uncle Sam will do the job right.

Mr. COLMER. But the point I am making is that the bill does not do that.

Mr. LESINSKI. Under the bill, however, you are going to deny food to any country under Communist domination. How then are you going to make this distribution of food? It just cannot be done.

Mr. COLMER. It cannot be done under the provisions of the bill, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Does the gentleman know that when Mr. Hoover appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee he commented on this very matter? He was asked this:

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Hoover, this act proposes to put funds and food into the countries through the foreign governments as channels by making contracts with them.

Mr. HOOPER. I do not want to sustain the "ins" in any government that there may be in any of these countries. I think probably putting the supplies through the channels outlined might operate to do that very thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the committee on this debate.

Mr. FULTON. Then I offer the gentleman my time, having time myself.

The CHAIRMAN. That cannot be done in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the shadow of Communist Russia falls across the threshold of every home, every pulpit, every schoolroom, and the pathway of every child in this world today; and for the creation of this monster who has all mankind shaking in its boots, we cannot escape at least part responsibility. The

hunger and suffering you propose to relieve are hunger and suffering which in part at least, has been brought about by Russia.

Russia is one of the two great world powers. Russia contributes nothing to relieve the distress that she has caused and there is no indication that she will do so.

We here in this bill continue the policy of appeasement which is responsible for a great many of our woes. The bill undermines the President in his determination to stop Russia through the extension of aid to Greece and Turkey and lowers public opinion in our ability to be realistic, consistent, or forthright about anything.

If the feeding and the clothing of all the world is a responsibility that rests upon us, without regard to friend or foe or for the effect upon our own people, then the bill is faultless; but if the solvency and the soundness of our Government, and if the security of our people, are our first consideration, then the bill is in part bad. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], as amended by the Mundt amendment, I am confident it would be well for this body to adopt because, as he observed, any relief extended must be administered in a sense by the government involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, further answering the previous gentleman on the matter we were discussing, Mr. Hoover was asked whether this would be the practical method of doing it when he was before the Committee on Foreign Affairs sitting in the Old House Office Building caucus room. We discussed this very question. In fact, I asked Mr. Hoover the question to find out whether it would be possible to accomplish this distribution in a way that we would not be putting the money and the food through channels that already existed in the governments of these countries. This question was asked:

Do you suggest any other methods of distribution to those countries, through our own people, possibly, or the Red Cross, or some other agency?

Mr. Hoover answered as follows:

One must bear in mind that all of these countries have a certain amount of food supply. They are all rationing their population. Whatever the imports are, they must be assimilated into their rationing systems. It is impossible to separate the imports from the domestic supplies.

Therefore, the primary dependence still must be placed on their rationing system and the only thing that we can do by way of control is to determine what would be a sufficiency to them, and then expect the country to see that they carry out distribution honestly. It is to check such action that I suggest there should be no contractual period. If they failed to carry out the very proper conditions which we laid out, then the supplies could be stopped.

Mr. Hoover with his adequate experience on the relief of starving peoples advocates to make use of the rationing systems of the various countries.

Mr. LESINSKI. Will the various welfare organizations help to carry out this work?

Mr. FULTON. We are going to do that. We are sending over people under the State Department who are going to watch closely to see that the program in each country is carried on in a proper way and have a fair system as between public and private agencies.

Mr. LESINSKI. There are some people who have food; there are others who have none.

Mr. FULTON. We are going to send people there to watch and see that starving people actually receive it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Hoover recommends that we not make a long-term contract. He suggests we send this food to them, and leave the supervision in the hands of our own people so we can discontinue it if they violate the working arrangement.

Mr. FULTON. That is exactly right. We are going to watch it closely. We are not going to get tied up by contracts that will tie our hands.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say that my amendment provides that that continues to be provided for because it does not change that contractual arrangement at all. It simply gives the advance guard of Americans the opportunity to see that the people who need it get relief rather than the people who go along with the particular creed of a particular political government over there.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to my good friend the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman knows I was in Europe 2 years ago. I share the same apprehension as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]. If it is channeled through the Government, this food supply will come under the same domination as our UNRRA supply, and it did not reach the people for whom it was intended.

Mr. FULTON. I was afraid of that, too. May I say that Mr. Hoover stated that the method proposed by this bill is the way to do it, and that it cannot be done in a practical way otherwise. I think the furnishing of this food is the best argument that democracy can go forward. It is our best advertising and salesmanship for democracy. This bill provides food, it is not armament we are giving them.

WE FOUGHT NAZISM AND THE JAPS

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed amazed by the statement that was made by my friend and colleague the gentleman from Georgia a few minutes ago, when he stated that Russia was responsible for the want and misery that

exist in the devastated countries of Europe.

Mr. COX. I said in part responsible.

Mr. SABATH. I am glad to hear the gentleman modify his statement. However, it seems that he has forgotten that it was Germany, the Nazis, that brought about this war; that we fought nazism and the Japs, not Russia. It was Russia that actually liberated the Poles, the Czechoslovakians, and the peoples of other eastern European countries. I regret that not only he but several other gentlemen continuously exaggerate the fear of communism and charge these people who are striving for freedom and liberty, who are opposed to oppression and exploitation, and who are seeking to better their living conditions, with being Communists. It is natural and proper that people of the smaller nations who were liberated by the Russian armies should show their appreciation by a friendly attitude.

THE PEOPLE ARE FREEDOM-LOVING DEMOCRATS

Now, what I want to bring home is this: I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin, and with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] when he says that the people of Hungary are not Communists. That is true of the other small countries. The people themselves are freedom-loving democrats, very similar to ourselves in temperament, in industry, and in devotion to our own principles of freedom and equality. I know these people, and I know they are not Communists.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that I sat for a total of 28 years on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am the only member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the First World War now sitting in this House. I think I can say with weight that I know something about Europe.

The Poles and the Czechoslovakians have a tradition of democracy and of representative government which goes back hundreds of years, long before German greed and might wiped out their independence. They kept alive their sacred flame of freedom, and at the first opportunity successfully rebelled against the Austro-Hungarian yoke and thus helped hasten the victorious end of the First World War. It is true that in both countries drastic measures have had to be taken to bridge over the emergency of postwar recovery and reconstruction; but these countries actually have coalition governments, in most of which the Communists are a small minority, just as among the people only a very small minority are Communists.

In Czechoslovakia particularly, President Eduard Benes has succeeded in maintaining a democratic and representative government despite all obstacles, just as he maintained the integrity of the constitutional Government of Czechoslovakia in exile after the Munich betrayal and through the horror of the war years.

Naturally, these countries are not going to start a war against Russia, as some of the gentlemen here seem to think this country should do; but that

does not mean they are dominated by Russia.

WHO WAS THE ENEMY?

It seems to me that certain gentlemen in this country are more solicitous of the welfare and future of the enemy which tried to destroy civilization at the cost of 20,000,000 casualties and the expenditure of billions upon billions of dollars, who wrought destruction and suffering and misery to nearly the whole of Europe, than for those who fought side by side with us, and who themselves suffered in their own lands destruction of property and of human life and of liberty.

Even while the war was on, there were Americans who assailed and criticized the people of Russia and Yugoslavia, and many went so far as to wish that Hitler and the Nazis could defeat Russia.

Almost to the same degree as now these people attacked Russia and what they termed "the Russian satellites," all for the purpose of creating a false fear that America and our form of government are endangered by communism.

There are fair-minded people in America who are not prejudiced by the flood of twisted propaganda from radio commentators, columnists, and writers, all subservient to the reactionaries, the vested interests, the cartels, and even the hidden Nazi-Fascist forces of the United States.

SHOULD DEMONSTRATE OUR SYMPATHY

I think we should demonstrate to these people who suffered from Nazi devastation, looting, stealing, and destruction that we sympathize with them; that we are desirous of showing our friendship again by offering them much-needed aid.

There are no finer people anywhere than those you are trying to exclude from the benefits of this legislation. Time after time the offspring and the descendants of those same people, here in our own country, have demonstrated, in war and in peace, that they are devoted to democratic institutions. They have given their lives in the fullest measure of proof for their country and ours; and the devotion to freedom and democracy of the people there in Europe is no less full.

No one is more opposed than I am to nurturing the spread of communism—but this bill is to provide aid to the starving and needy people of the devastated countries.

The way to win friends for our kind of democracy is to make communism unattractive by showing the greater benefits of democratic liberties and high living standards.

RELIEF INTENDED FOR VICTIMS OF NAZI AGGRESSION

Remember that the people this bill is intended to help are the ruthless victims of Nazi oppression.

Since 1933—for 14 long years—they have been engaged in a constant struggle to maintain their independence and to establish free governments of their own.

Hitler drove the people of southeastern Europe toward the arms of Russia by a declared war of extermination which, had it not been for Allied victory, would have cost 30,000,000 lives.

I venture to say that 95 percent of the people in these devastated areas are not Communist. They are patriotic nationals of their own countries. They are trying to find a way to restore stable government and stable economy after 14 years of horror and looting and killing, against foreign aggression, and encirclement.

We have not heard a word on this floor in regard to the dangers from fascism in this country or in Europe.

The fact is that there is greater danger from Nazi-Fascist dictatorship than there is from Communist dictatorship, both here and abroad.

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST ABUSE ARE PROVIDED

Although what we provide in this bill is only 57 percent of the total amount of money needed to prevent misery and starvation in these war-torn countries, we will have full and complete control of the distribution of the supplies bought with the money.

Inspection and reports are provided.

I feel that the bill is so carefully drawn that misuse is practically impossible.

I am equally certain that every precaution will be taken by the administrators to see that no country and no people entitled to aid will receive assistance.

Remember that it has not been Russia who has threatened the independence of the Slavic people, not only during the Hitler period but for centuries back, but the Germans with their dreams of the "drang nach osten"—the drive to the east.

Pan-Germanism has threatened to engulf all Europe time after time. The Germans have always intended, and I suspect they still intend if they get the chance, to enslave all the Balkans and the Ukraine and Poland for a victorious march to the southern seas through eastern Europe.

It was the Russians who liberated the Slavic countries from the Nazi tyranny. They would be less than human if they did not feel grateful to Russia.

The United States has helped South American countries.

I hope that they are grateful for that help.

But that does not mean that we dominate the countries of South America or dictate their policies.

MARSHALL REPORT ENCOURAGING

The report to the Nation made by the Secretary of State, Gen. George C. Marshall, is encouraging and reassuring, in spite of the seeming lack of conclusiveness of the conferences, and it should be gratifying to the American people who have no desire to be plunged into a Third World War.

Both General Marshall and Premier Stalin feel that there is ample opportunity for understanding and cooperation between our country and Russia. That opinion also has been expressed by former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles. I feel sure that if the opinion for former Secretary of State Cordell Hull could be obtained he would agree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Colmer amendment and in opposition to the Mundt substitute. I see no particular good or harm to be gained out of the Smith amendment first proposed.

Let us not forget that this is the first full-dress foreign-policy debate in this House. The world is watching this debate. Parties and members will be weighed by people in every district in our country, and by the people of the world, as to whether they are isolationists or men who understand what is happening in the new world, by how they vote here when the yeas and nays are called on the vote that has already gone through on the \$200,000,000 proposal, and the vote that is to come on the whole bill. Let us try to lift the scales from the eyes of people who will not see. Those who are doing what they are in trying to kill this bill are playing directly into the hands of Russia. We had it demonstrated last night. General Marshall said that Premier Stalin told him that what he wants is delay—that there is no hurry about settling Europe's problems. He wants Europe, which is hungry and destitute, to get no help from America, to get no state of security and order. The U. S. S. R. for example is absolutely opposed to any action to take care of the refugees and DP's; they say, send them back to the countries they came from, even to those countries where they are sure to be persecuted for their political opinions. Why? Because no settlement—despair, discord, misery—all those things play into the hands of a communism which promise relief to such unfortunates. Communism is a religion for the desperate. If you want it, defeat this bill.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. In other words, you cannot teach a man democracy on an empty stomach.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly, and you cannot teach dead men not to be Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I hope you will realize the facts about a few things that are going on abroad and amalgamate them into your thinking. In these countries that are back of the "iron curtain" there is no possibility whatsoever of any United States agency going in and finding out who is hungry and saying, "Here, my friend, here is something for you to eat." Those countries all have rationing systems, ration cards, and they are not going to permit you to go in there and find the hungry and feed them. You must do it through the local government organization. That is the first thing.

Then, of course, the second thing that comes along is the question, Who has the ration cards? Of course, many of you know, or you have heard people from abroad tell you that those ration cards that carry the greatest amount of food go to those who are subservient to the Communist way of thinking, and the

others get them if they are willing to go along. Many of them have taken out Communist cards in order to get ration cards. It is the Russian Government that is holding back on these people and not us. They use the ration card as a political weapon. If by any means whatsoever our country can devise a way so that the rationing is distributed equally in those countries, and fairly, as we see a thing as fair, then we will have done something worth while and can help in the feeding of those people who are being permitted to starve. That is basic.

The next thing is that they are obtaining from every one of those people behind the iron curtain a complete list of their relatives in the United States by name and address; and here in this country, as I am sure the gentleman from South Dakota can tell you, they are contacting those relatives and saying, "Now, your friends and relatives are with us. Will you go along with us or won't you?" It is a powerful persuader and aids in the building of the Communist fifth column in this country.

We have that sort of thing to combat. It is not such a simple matter as one might assume. In our way of thinking it is hard to understand. We must put ourselves in the same way of thinking in our own minds as they think in Europe before we can understand those things. That is the basic reason why I must oppose the amendment offered by my good friend from Mississippi. I think the gentleman from South Dakota is trying to do the right thing in his amendment, but I am sure it will be not at all effective, because of course the Russian Government would not any more allow that sort of agent to go in there and say who is going to get food in those countries than we would allow the Soviet agents to come into this country and say whether or not their sympathizers here shall obtain their help from abroad.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman's contention is correct—and it conceivably may be—then at least the Russian Government, which deprives its own people of food that we are offering to make available to them, is undermining itself.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that the Soviet Government has a way of removing nonconformists. More than 20,000,000 of them are said to have disappeared, and many are taken every day to concentration camps worse than Buchenwald or Dachau. Behind the iron curtain it takes real courage to maintain the human right to freedom.

Mr. Chairman, no one here has denied that these peoples were sold out at Yalta. Under authority to extend my remarks, I include the following articles, the purport of which has not been denied:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 27, 1947]

ROOSEVELT OUTTRADED BY STALIN AT YALTA—MOSCOW PUBLICATION OF FACT SHOWS UNITED STATES COMMITTED

(By Jay G. Hayden)

The late President Roosevelt's amazing secret generosity to Premier Stalin at Yalta has again been evidenced in the publication at

Moscow of the agreement of these two with Churchill dissenting, on a \$20,000,000,000 total of reparations from Germany, 50 percent of it for Russia.

Secretary of State Marshall disputed Molotov's reassertion of this claim on the ground that it had been superseded at Potsdam, and Foreign Secretary Bevin said it was of no standing anyhow because Churchill refused to sign it.

The ink scarcely had dried on the joint communiqué, following the Yalta Conference, before it became apparent that much more went on there than was immediately revealed.

The communiqué was issued on February 12, 1945, and just a week later it cropped up that the Atlantic Charter had been revised. As originally written, this document said its signers, Roosevelt and Churchill, "wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

"AGGRESSOR NATIONS"

At Yalta there was added to this sentence the words, "by the aggressor nations," the obvious purpose being to exempt territories taken forcibly by so-called "nonaggressor nations," such as Russia's conquest of the Baltic States and portions of Poland, Finland, and Rumania.

Since the Atlantic Charter was issued solely by Roosevelt and Churchill, presumably they had the right to change it in the same personal fashion, but it is doubtful if this is so of other secret agreements which were subscribed to at Yalta.

On February 27, 1945, Churchill for the first time revealed details of the agreement respecting Polish borders, including modification of the Curzon Line to give Russia the important city of Lwow, and allotment to Poland of the German province of Upper Silesia and "such other territories east of the Oder River as may be decided at the peace conference."

The latter referred to the Oder-Neisse River line, transferring to Poland territory containing 9,500,000 Germans.

In his Stuttgart speech last year Secretary Byrnes began trying to mitigate that commitment and Secretary Marshall is expected to do the same.

Yalta was little more than a month old before it leaked out successively that the Ukraine and White Russia had been recognized separately in order to give Russia three votes in the United Nations, and that Russia's insistence on an "individual veto" in that body also had been acceded to.

BIGGEST CONCESSION

Not till February 1946 did there come to light the biggest concession of all to the Soviet. This was the grant to her in exchange for a promise to enter the war against Japan "within 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered." To what that assurance Roosevelt and Churchill signed away to Russia Outer Mongolia, the whole Kurile chain of islands, half of the island of Sakhalin, and in Manchuria exclusive occupation of the Port Arthur naval base and a half share with China in control of the commercial port of Dalren.

China was not even consulted before this purloining of her territory, and as subsequently developed, Russia's entrance into the Japanese war, on the very last day of her commitment, bred nothing but trouble. Ever since, the United States and Britain have been trying to get the Russian Armies back home.

Not the least interesting element in all this was President Roosevelt's assumption of the right single-handed to commit the Nation. Members of Congress have searched in vain for any provision, constitutional or otherwise, that invests the President with such broad right, except as his proposals later

may be submitted to the Senate and approved by it.

In this instance also there is the fact that Mr. Roosevelt at Yalta was reduced both physically and mentally. He died 2 months later. It is no wonder, perhaps, that he was outtraded by Stalin, but this circumstance calls all the more for some action to assure that this sort of thing shall not happen again.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 21, 1947]

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Bit by bit the falsity and inadequacy of all measures taken during and since the war to keep the peace come to light. These are the falsity of the concept of congenitally good and bad nations, according to which nature has shown favoritism in distributing righteousness and sin; the idea that perpetual punishment is an agent of reform; the belief that the calculated destruction of energies anywhere can contribute to general prosperity; the empty hope that a common law can emerge without a common ethos; and, finally, that the structure erected and hailed at San Francisco is an instrument of collective security, and the "beginning"—as President Roosevelt put it—of a world constitution.

"Murder will out," and so will truth—no matter what is marked "top secret." The truth has been out for a long time for anyone with eyes to see. Even for the nonreligious there must have been some significance in the fact that the San Francisco Conference opened without an appeal for the blessing of God. The peace devised could bear reference to no standards, so prayer was properly omitted.

But, as the roadside posters used to proclaim in the small-town evangelical communities of my childhood: "Be sure your sins will find you out."

They will.

In Moscow it is revealed that the United States, at Yalta, agreed to reparations: the form of the forced labor of human persons—to be delivered regardless of any crimes they may have committed. They were common soldiers, drafted like other soldiers, and by an omnipotent state in which conscientious objection was a capital crime. They were protected during the war by the self-interest of those whose nationals were also prisoners and by those conventions designed somewhat to mitigate the barbarisms of war.

Then, after surrender, to the gallows with those who imported forced labor to Germany, and up with the new slaveholders.

What of you, President Roosevelt, who had sworn on your deepest political conviction and religious faith that the Allies will not enslave the German people, because the Allies do not traffic in human slavery?

Yet your signature was on that infamy. How desperately ill you must have been. Perhaps not always there, already—at moments—as the weeping Churchill reported, as though in another world.

What of you, Mr. Churchill—intrepid lover of freedom? Magnanimous, sanguine, and in some ways wise.

And what of you, Mr. Stalin? For nearly a generation invoking the solidarity of the workers of the world.

Did you think that nazism would be on trial in victory over it?

Democracy, freedom, communism were, and are, on trial.

How broken their citadels.

Now comes President Truman calling for resolute action. The United Nations is designed to make possible lasting freedom and independence for all its members, but, "we have considered how the United Nations might assist in this [the Greek] crisis. But the situation is an urgent one requiring im-

mediate action, and the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required."

The definition of a "crisis" implies "urgency."

The UN was never designed as an organization that could create a world law and a world police, through which alone the freedom of all could be maintained. The terrible gaps were in the original Dumbarton Oaks plan. Yet the State Department itself went up and down the country selling it to the American people as an infallible instrument of collective security, and to raise a doubt was almost high treason.

H. G. Wells said of the League of Nations to a lady who thought it a beginning: "You can't make an automobile out of the beginnings of a perambulator." The UN is no better.

It was never possible to enforce peace. Only law can be enforced. Without world law there can be no world police; without a world ethos there can be no law.

The United States has no authority to police the world. The UN has no authority either because it is not an instrument of law, but only an international debating society participated in by sovereign states each swayed by sacred egotism.

That is the trouble and the United States should take its stand, not in Greece nor on German reparations, but on UN reform—making it a genuine law-creating and law-enforcing agency. There we can afford a show-down, because our position will be above reproach.

As Senator Tydings said, "The sands in the hourglass grow less and less."

[From the Washington Post]

ROOSEVELT AT YALTA

(By Ernest Lindley)

VIOLATED AGREEMENTS CAUSE TROUBLE

It is being said more and more frequently that President Roosevelt was outtraded at the Yalta Conference. Certainly he made some very important concessions to the Russians. In view of subsequent developments, it is regrettable that certain of these concessions were made.

Roosevelt knew he was paying a high price. But he did not believe that it was too high for what he was promised in return.

First, he obtained specific Russian commitments to join the war against Japan. As it turned out, we did not need Russian aid against Japan. But in February 1945 the prevailing view was that Russian participation would shorten the war against Japan and save many American lives. This was certainly the view of the President's principal military advisers. We did not yet have atomic bombs and could not be sure that we would have them. The first great fire raids with B-29's had not yet been launched. There was, moreover, a widely held view that even if Japan proper were rather thoroughly bombed out—and perhaps even if it were conquered—the Japanese armies on the continent would continue to fight, using Manchuria, with its war industries, as a base.

Secondly, Roosevelt sought assurance that the portions of eastern Europe overrun by the Red Army in the process of defeating the Axis would be restored as independent democratic nations. He sought and obtained assurance that provisional governments in these countries would represent all democratic parties and that they would be compelled to hold free elections. The Soviet Union agreed that the handling of these matters should be a joint responsibility of the Big Three, not of the Soviet Union alone. These agreements were warmly applauded in Congress. As Roosevelt himself said, they were not all that could be desired. But they would have served adequately if the Soviet Union had lived up to them.

It is true that various ambiguities and loopholes assisted the Soviet Union in evading its commitments. But the Kremlin plainly violated not only the spirit but the letter of these pledges.

Roosevelt saw before his death that the Soviet Union was welching on its pledge concerning the reconstruction of the Polish provisional government. He was anxious and angry.

A third objective which Roosevelt sought at Yalta was to nail down Soviet participation in the United Nations. The Soviet Union had never shown much real interest in the United Nations idea. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference had left unsolved the critical question of great power voting rights. Roosevelt worked out a compromise at Yalta. It was probably as good a compromise as could be obtained. The Soviet Union has been trying to pull away from that compromise ever since. It has consistently stood for very broad interpretations of the veto right of the great powers. It brought the San Francisco Conference to a temporary impasse on this very question.

Concerning several of the concessions made by Roosevelt at Yalta, it should be noted further that he conceded no more than he was powerless to prevent. For example, the United States could not prevent the Soviet Union from moving into Manchuria and reestablishing a base at Port Arthur and control over the Manchurian railroads. It could not prevent the Soviet Union from occupying the southern half of Sakhalin Island or controlling Outer Mongolia. Neither China nor any other nation could prevent the Soviet Union from taking these steps. Roosevelt considered it better to have a definite understanding on such questions in advance rather than to wait until the Soviet Union was in physical control of these areas. The Soviet Union also apparently wanted a definite understanding not only with the United States and Britain but with China.

Taken as a whole, the main trouble with the Yalta agreements was not that Roosevelt was outtraded but that the Soviet Union failed to keep some of its pledges. The United States was outcollected. Any bargain which is observed by one side but violated by the other side is bound to be lopsided in its effect.

For the failure to bring more pressure sooner on the Russians to keep their promises many things and men are to blame. But Roosevelt is not among them insofar as the Yalta pledges are concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlemen from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I am willing and anxious, as in the past, to render every possible assistance I can to the troubled, confused, misled, and misplaced peoples of the earth. The law of self-preservation, however, prompts me to oppose communism with all my strength. I hope that the House will adopt the amendment which excludes communistic-dominated countries from participating in any funds we may appropriate. From the days when the Greeks, who had been unsuccessfully besieging a city for 9 years, finally captured and destroyed that city by secretly introducing within its walls their own soldiers concealed in a harmless-looking wooden horse, mankind has always been more or less aware that secret enemies within the gates are far more dangerous than open enemies without. Today and for a long time the United States has been harboring and even protecting a Trojan horse in the form of communism. Now at long last, and in the present criti-

cal condition of the world, we are becoming aware of the hostile, powerful, dangerous presence in our midst of a secret group of persons calling themselves Americans but giving paramount allegiance to a foreign power.

Communism is not dangerous as a mere political theory, or as a mere economic theory. It must stand or fall by its own effectiveness or failure in operation. We do not bar thinking in this country. People have a right to ideas, even to ideas of change. We cannot legislate against ideas, and we do not wish to do so. All we ask is that ideas be submitted to the bar of reason and public opinion. Nor is communism dangerous because its adherents constitute a political party. We believe in political parties in this country. They are essential to the mechanism of democratic government, and this is true not only of the two major political parties but of the numerous smaller political parties—the parties built around one idea, which from time to time have appeared, and not infrequently have contributed to the development of the Nation.

However, the communism with which we are faced today is not a theory or a political party, but a conspiracy. It is a highly organized, closely integrated, strongly disciplined organization, ceaselessly plotting to overthrow the Government of the United States, as part of a world-wide revolution. Under whatever camouflage of idealistic verbiage its positions are urged, it has one immediate purpose from which it never deviates, which is to support the designs of Soviet Russia.

It is surprising indeed that American citizens, enjoying the prosperity and freedom of this country, a degree of prosperity and freedom never before enjoyed by the masses of plain people in any country in the whole history of the world, can be brought to plot against the security of the country which gave them these benefits. Read the report of the Canadian Royal Commission which investigated the Soviet spy ring in Canada, and see how it is done. Scientists violated their own oaths in order to betray the secrets of atomic energy to agents of Moscow. Add to that group an array of the frustrated, the discontented, the misfits, and the victims of injustices as still remain in our democracy, and then let these all be manipulated by the shrewd, unprincipled, highly trained leadership of masters of intrigue, themselves financed and directed by an international organization, and there you have a picture of communism as we have to deal with it within the borders of this country.

The communistic conspiracy has a highly developed technique, elaborated by international experts, who have spent decades in studying how to create mass discontent and disorder, and how to use the confusion thus created to further their own purposes. The methods are well known, and have been considerably publicized, yet they are not always easy to recognize on the spot when they are in operation.

The first objective is to infiltrate into the armed forces, create bad morale and propagandize soldiers and sailors so that

they will aid or at least not hinder an actual taking over of the country by physical force. It was in this way that the original Communist success was gained in the Russian revolution of 1918. We have been very fortunate in this respect in this country. Before the war, efforts to win our servicemen did not get much response, and official quarters were on their guard. During the war there was not much danger because we were fighting on the same side as Russia. The situation is different now.

The next great area in which Communists plan first to infiltrate and then to dominate, is organized labor. Organized labor, where captured, provides them with a source of funds, a propaganda outlet, a means for stirring discontent, and if necessary, a weapon of sabotage. "Controlled unions," as a recent writer points out, "contribute heavily to the various party fronts and causes. They in turn serve as fronts for diverse propaganda schemes. They can picket consulates and Government offices with practiced skill. When conditions warrant, strikes can be provoked so as to create the atmosphere of unrest in which communism thrives. And, finally, if communistic policy so dictates, they can actually sabotage essential production. Thus the 1945 shipping strike to bring back the soldiers—American, not Russian—was an example of political sabotage, intended to weaken the United States on the international front. The method ordinarily used to gain control of a labor union is to send a few organizers to work in a plant, then join the union, then gain minor offices in the union, then start currents of discontent against the helpless officers of the union, then get themselves or certain handpicked tools, elected to the higher offices, then expel or discredit any local opposition which may exist, and eventually control the funds and adopt policies. When, as sometimes happens, their men by similar tactics have reached top positions in the international union, they can both rule and perpetuate their own power.

Communists never neglect the intellectual front. By such measures as were revealed in Canada, they penetrate academic circles, as well as dramatic, musical, artistic, and literary groups. They publish vast amounts of literature, skillfully adapted to different classes of readers. Some of it is frankly Communist. More is disguised to seem non-Communist.

Liberal-minded persons in all circles, and especially in government, are a particular target. Being open-minded, and proud of being so, they are ready to listen to new ideas, and not always shrewd enough to find out they are being used. Being sympathetic to the underprivileged, they sometimes prove credulous to communistic claims of idealism. Entirely innocent and loyal Americans are liable to find their names used to guarantee the respectability of organizations whose real, though covert, purpose is revolution. Every effort is made by Communists to get these sympathizers, if not their own members, into key positions in government, labor, education, military life. By and large their success has,

fortunately for us, not been commensurate with their efforts.

I am not here discussing the theoretical basis of communism. As I said before, its future as an economic and political theory will be judged by mankind on its merits. I do wish to point out, however, that it is spiritually at the furthest removed from all that has made for the best life of America. Communism is sheer materialism. Beginning from its founder, Karl Marx, it excludes spiritual considerations, except, of course, where it finds it can use them temporarily for purposes of strategy. Its interpretation of history is purely in terms of economic determination. It has no theory of human rights as against the powers of the state: witness the millions of slave laborers now in concentration camps in Russia. It renounces religion as the "opiate of the people," and for years promoted the Godless League. For years it tried unsuccessfully to rid Russia of religion altogether. Now it tolerates what it could not destroy, but atheism is still part of its basic theory, and it regards the Christian church as its worst enemy.

Communism acknowledges no moral laws where the interests of the state, as conceived by its leaders and dictators, may be involved. Lies are an instrument of policy. Communist leaders are always changing their names, hiding under aliases, and traveling about the world on forged passports. A denial by a Communist that he is a Communist means nothing. The party lists are kept smaller than they need to be so that it will not even be suspected that many of the most active agents are Communists. In any case party lists are not made public and sources of income are secret. There is little doubt that over a long period the American Communist Party was directly financed from Russia, just as its policies have always been imported from the same country.

Evidence on the latter point is crystal clear. The leaders of American communism are not elected by the members. They are chosen by and may be deposed by Moscow, as in the recent deposition of Earl Browder. The "party line" in America is not the consensus of common thinking by American Communists, it is the line laid down abroad. The party cannot even hold a convention except by the consent of the executive committee of the Communist International. When a convention is held, representatives of the International have the right to participate in meetings both of the central party and local organizations, and oppose the American leaders if the "line" of the latter "diverges from the instructions of the executive committee of the Communist International."

The Communist International was theoretically terminated by Stalin during the war, as a gesture to his western allies. There is no reason to doubt that it functions as always, directed by Moscow, its decisions reaching American Communists via Paris.

The number of American Communists is so small, with less than 100,000 enrolled, and its program so at variance with American ideas, institutions, and needs, that the whole movement might

easily be regarded as negligible so far as our domestic affairs are concerned. Indeed it has for exactly these reasons been disregarded by most Americans. But in these days of international tension with Russia we cannot disregard this fifth column in our midst. By every possible means these people are working day and night for Russia and against the United States.

It is part of Communist theory that a third world war is inevitable. No less a person than Stalin himself wrote in his chief theoretical work, "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist interminably side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or another must conquer." While Stalin has recently been reported to have expressed himself in a more pacific vein, to foreign newspaper men, the sentiment I have just quoted was the serious expression of an earlier date used to indoctrinate his followers in the true faith of communism, representing certainly his earlier and almost equally certain his real philosophy. It is and has always been a commonplace of Communist theory.

A recent writer—James Burnham, in *Life* magazine, March 31, 1947—asserts, and everything we know confirms the truth of his assertion, that Communist policy regards the present period as a period of preparation for the third world war, and considers that it has in this period two specific tasks to perform: The first is to consolidate an effective domination of Europe and Asia. The second is to infiltrate and weaken all countries which cannot be brought under Communist control.

All you and I have to do is to lift our eyes and see these two efforts being made before us. In Europe, Russia prolongs the misery of the people with the deliberate intention of forcing them into communism. We see the tentacles of Russian power reaching out in Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Finland, the Balkan countries, Germany, and France—some of these countries have already succumbed. We see the moves being made in Turkey, Iran, China, Korea. That is the story—or part of the story—abroad.

Here at home the other part is being played—the infiltration and weakening of the United States, so that it will not be a hindrance to Red fascism abroad and will in time be ready to drop, as other countries have already dropped, into the lap of communism.

It may be that in this era we will have to face acute conflict. The words from Stalin which I quoted a moment ago may well be put alongside those of another dictator whose power grew out of another revolution, and whose attempted conquests of Europe were stopped only at the cost of enormous bloodshed. This was Napoleon Bonaparte. After his wars were over, and he was in exile at St. Helena, he thus described the situation:

If we fought all over the continent, it was because two societies stood face to face: that which dates from 1789 and the old regime; they could not live together, and the younger devoured the other. (Quoted in Nickerson: *Can We Limit War?* p. 192.)

Again two societies stand face to face, and the younger is again trying to devour the other. Let us be aware what we face. Let us avert this disaster, if possible, by bold and courageous policies abroad, and by wise protection of our own land at home from those who seek its overthrow from within.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I need to take second place to any man in the House in consistent opposition to the Communist philosophy and the actions of the Soviet Government both in the Far East and in Europe. It is precisely because I want, in the words of my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], to consider the problem solely from the standpoint of the coldest realism that I beg of you not to pass his amendment. Everybody knows that at least 20 Poles are against communism for every one who is for it and by passing the Colmer amendment right here we withhold relief from up to 20 of our friends to avoid the possibility of some food per chance getting to one of our enemies.

Who is going to overthrow communism in eastern Europe—Americans? No; it must be the Poles and Hungarians and the Austrians and the other peoples who live there. How in God's name will they be able or encouraged to do it if we start out by telling them we are not even going to try to get any help to them.

If you read all of the resolution, gentlemen, you will find many and stringent safeguards are already provided to prevent misuse of relief supplies to build up the government in power rather than minister to the neediest. It is too bad that all of the debate has had to be on the amendments to the first section of the joint resolution before we have reached the provisions having to do with the safeguards and limitations. If we could have handled the Colmer substitute amendment later after we had examined the whole bill and perhaps even written in more stringent safeguards, then I do not think so many would have felt this amendment is necessary or wise. To me, it is tragic for the hungry in Communist-dominated Poland and Hungary and short-sighted for ourselves for us to serve notice on them here and now that we are not even going to make an effort to get assistance to them, stopping it if and when it proves impossible to get fair distribution. If I were a Communist organizer in Poland or Hungary I cannot think of anything that I would like more than to be able to say to the people, "Your western friends are walking out on you." Many people would inevitably feel they have little choice, as the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] well said, but to join up with the Communists and get a ration card in order to eat.

I am for the Mundt amendment. I want us to try our utmost to get our relief to those people who need it. It would make the Colmer substitute defensible. Relief would be withheld from Communist-dominated countries only if the rulers refused to let us administer

it. But if we cannot pass the Mundt amendment, let us reject the Colmer substitute too. Let us not serve notice on the victims of Russia that we condemn them to starvation. Let Russia refuse to allow them food if she wants to, but let America not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi says that he has been in Europe, but he has not been in Poland. I think it would be good if about 30 or 40 of the Members of Congress went to Poland to see that country. Members of Congress have been all over Europe seeing the conditions there but they have not been in Poland. The gentleman from Mississippi, therefore, does not speak as an authority on Poland because he has not been there. No doubt, he probably flew over it on his way to Moscow, but he did not set foot on Polish soil. If he had, he would probably agree with what General Eisenhower told me at the reception of our former Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. General Eisenhower said, there is no country and no people who have been so thoroughly ruined and despoiled as the Polish Nation and the Polish people. The Polish orphan population in the times before the war was 30,000. That was the normal orphan population. Today, it is over a million. There are over a million orphans. Now, get this picture. The orphans have increased from 30,000 to a million. Who is taking care of them? There are Catholic orphanages and institutions and private institutions of all kinds. The Friends organization is there, as well as state organizations trying to help. Who is going to deny to these children the chance to get something to eat?

I have here an article which appeared in the New York Times of this morning. The headline says, "Church peril seen by Polish primate." Cardinal Hlond asks firm stand against heathendom.

I want all of you to read that article in this morning's New York Times. Here is Cardinal Hlond, a great representative of the Catholic church, speaking out openly in Warsaw, Poland—not here, not in Rome, but in Warsaw—telling the people to fight communism and to stand up and fight heathendom.

How are you going to help Cardinal Hlond? How are you going to help the Catholic church in Poland? By adopting the Colmer amendment and by denying a piece of bread to them and by making the people go to Russia and to Stalin for a piece of bread? Is that how you will uphold the hand of Cardinal Hlond and these others who are fighting communism in that country today? No. That is not the right way to fight this battle.

Here is an article that appeared in the Pittsburgh press this morning, and it quotes Henry J. Osinski, who was one of the five men we sent down to supervise UNRRA distribution in Poland. By the way, that UNRRA distribution in Poland was a job well done.

I hope you will all read these two articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the New York Times]

**CHURCH PERIL SEEN BY POLISH PRIMATE—
PASTORAL LETTER BY CARDINAL HLOND ASKS
FIRM STAND AGAINST "HEATHENDOM"**

(By Sydney Gruson)

WARSAW, April 28.—Auguste Cardinal Hlond called on the people of Poland this week end to oppose the "modern heathendom" that is trying to "replace the worship of the Creator with the cult of the creature and worldliness."

In a pastoral letter, read from all church pulpits on the 950th anniversary of St. Wojciech's death, the Catholic primate of Poland declared: "We must not avoid a showdown against heathendom."

This was his first public statement since his pastoral letter before the election, in which he urged the people to vote against the government bloc.

FIRM OPPOSITION INDICATED

The cardinal's careful choice of language in the new letter did not hide implications that the church would continue to oppose communism in Poland even though Communists have won control of the Government.

"There can be no truce between Christendom and impious irreligiosity," Cardinal Hlond declared. "It is the desire of providence that Poland repulse absolutely the attempt of atheists, tempting with the pretenses and nothing but pretenses of a philosophy of the future and with the beautiful idea of progress."

The cardinal described the church's position in Poland as "internally strong" and "externally unclear but calm."

Kazimierz Praszynski, Polish Government spokesman, is in Rome negotiating with the Vatican for a new concordat. Cardinal Hlond expressed the belief that "Polish political thought will find a proper, perhaps even an original, manner for settling the relations between the church and the state."

MENACING CHAOS SEEN

"Modern heathendom takes different shapes and the nation's reactions to its operation are not uniform," the cardinal said. "It has brought about in many countries a menacing chaos."

"It has met no success in Poland, but it persistently repeats its endeavors to take the spiritual leadership of the Nation. Ungodliness would like to take root not only in the factory suburbs but also in the great rural parishes."

"The proclaimers of atheism cannot forgive the church for warning the faithful of the dangers of faithlessness."

He said the excesses in Polish life "make the reconstruction of normal conditions impossible." He noted that "Poland is not the worst in such matters," and concluded with a demand that "the nation must have its Catholic conscience returned to it."

In another approach between the Government and the church recently, the church episcopate submitted a 15-point memorial to Premier Joseph Cyrankiewicz, asking that freedom of press, speech, and conscience be made principles of the new constitution, now being written. Human liberties and human dignity should be fully guaranteed, the memorial said.

[From the Pittsburgh Press]

**HALF OF CHILDREN SUFFER TB YET ALL POLAND
RETAINS HOPE—VISITOR REPORTS NATION IS
GRATEFUL TO UNITED STATES**

Poland today is a country where half the children have tuberculosis, and 100 percent of the people have hope.

A picture of the war-torn country—and its gratitude for American help—was painted today by Henry J. Osinski, executive secretary of American Relief for Poland.

Mr. Osinski has returned from 15 months behind Poland's own iron curtain, where he directed American relief supplies.

LOOK TO UNITED STATES

He will speak tonight to the Allegheny County branch of the Polish relief group at 7:30 p. m. in Soldiers and Sailors Memorial.

The slender, Buffalo-born Mr. Osinski is silent on political affairs, mostly because he intends to return in June.

But he is strong in the conviction that the average Polish citizen looks up to the United States as the greatest country in the world, and Poland's eventual savior.

"When we would take our trucks into small Polish towns," he said, "people would run up and kiss the painted American flags on the sides."

"People who hadn't seen an American in 6 years would tell me, 'We knew you would come'."

Crowds would gather around the caravan and give endless cheers for Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and possibly a few truly remembered movie stars.

HIS AUTO CARRIED BY PARADERS

On several occasions the cheering crowds picked up Mr. Osinski's light sedan bodily and paraded it through the streets.

"It almost ruined it," he admits.

He said that his committee, which now dispenses more than a half-million meals a day was given complete freedom to tour in Poland.

Its food and clothing were given out only under strict rules—the strictest being that each person receiving help must know it was given by the people of the United States.

NO RACE OR CREED RESTRICTIONS

No government agency was allowed to distribute anything, and goods were given to those who needed them without regard to race or creed, Mr. Osinski said.

The help already given has been great, Mr. Osinski said, but it will have to keep up for at least another year.

Crops were damaged by floods, and the country is still far from recovered. An estimated 300,000 are still living in caves and German-built bunkers in Warsaw alone.

Most pathetic to Mr. Osinski are the children. Checks have shown that about half are suffering tuberculosis and another 35 percent are in danger of tuberculosis from malnutrition.

Their greatest immediate need is food, especially milks and fats. Mr. Osinski said any donation would help.

"It is the greatest advertisement for democracy money can buy," he concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, it has been brought to my attention by a number of veterans who have their homes in trailers parked at the Washington Tourist Park that they are to be evicted. I also understand that these veterans have been living at this location for at least 2 years and many of them were compelled to invest their life savings in these trailer homes so that they could be located in this area where they could attend schools, job training, and where they could be employed while going to school at nights. Many of the wives are also employed in order to help their veteran husbands through school. These trailers have been kept neat and clean. The veterans have been and are good, respectable citizens. They have been paying the Washington Tourist Park

in the vicinity of \$2,000 per month rent for the few facilities they receive. Everything possible has been done to make their trailer camp a good, quiet, clean, respectable community. They have not in any way interfered with the transient trade of the Washington Tourist Park, but they have taken pride in the area in which they live and have tried to keep it up in a way in which the transient trade does not do, as is a well-known fact to the park authorities.

When the veterans heard that they were to be evicted they immediately started out to check the surrounding area for suitable places to park their trailers. They looked in vain because there is not a trailer park within a radius of 25 miles that could accommodate 100 trailers. The Temple Trailer Park was the only one that compared favorably with the Washington Tourist Park as to cleanliness and accommodations but it is filled and will have no vacancies for several months. The other camps were filthy and unsuitable even though they had no accommodations. The zoning of the surrounding area is such that trailers cannot park anywhere but in an authorized camp.

When the veterans started to move into the Washington Tourist Park it was with the idea that they would be allowed to stay there until such time as the war housing emergency was over and they could find suitable dwellings for themselves and families. The war emergency is not over yet and the housing shortage is still acute. Therefore I can see no reason why the Department of the Interior should not allow the veterans to remain in their present location under the same status as they have been allowed to stay there for the past 2 years until the emergency is over and the housing situation is such that these veterans can be assimilated into low-cost, livable homes. I would like to recommend, however, that the present location be improved by installing running water and drainage on all of the trailer lots instead of only a few. I have inspected this area many times and having stopped at trailer parks across the continent, I find this one very well equipped for permanent trailer parking with the exception of the above improvement.

Mr. Chairman, this is an emergency in which even the temporary housing situation for the veteran must be taken care of and I hope you will join with us in protecting the rights of these veterans so they may keep their trailers, their only homes, in the Washington Tourist Park until the housing emergency ends.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I boarded a plane in Cleveland at 6 o'clock this morning, and the only reading matter I could find on the plane was the New York Times, and I had to read it for 2 hours. There is a lot of good reading in it, including foreign news. Thirteen foreign articles appeared in the New York Times this morning—dispatches from various parts of the world. I can readily understand why there is

so much confusion on the floor of the House and why there is so much muddled thinking, not only in this country but throughout the world, when you get the substance of what those statesmen and politicians in other countries are talking about. As a matter of fact, I heard my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] tell about democracy at work in Czechoslovakia. I read an article concerning Czechoslovakia's confiscating all private industry and making it a part of the state. Well, if that is democracy, then I do not know what democracy is.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. O'KONSKI. With regard to democracy in Czechoslovakia, they recently hanged the Catholic monsignor for preaching his faith.

Mr. BENDER. While the gentleman is on his feet, will he conclude his earlier speech and say how he feels about this bill?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Well, it is hard to say what I wanted to say in half an hour, in 1 minute, but it is my opinion that we have been following a double-dealing, stupid foreign policy for the past 5 years, and this bill is merely a continuation of that same stupid, double-dealing foreign policy. By that I simply mean, if we are going to adopt a policy of fighting communism, I contend that as long as our State Department recognizes a government imposed upon the people of Poland by force and by aggression, so long is that State Department not consistent in its policy of fighting communism. There is only one way to fight communism, and that is to quit recognizing any government imposed by force that preaches the doctrine of communism. You are not going to stop communism by sending bread. I have more than a thousand communications in my office from people in those downtrodden countries, and not one of them asked for bread. They ask for freedom. They ask to be unyoked from this beast of communism that has been thrust upon them. Until we have cleaned house in our State Department, or we have a State Department that follows one consistent policy, you will never get rid of communism. They talk about stopping communism in Poland. One part of the State Department was asking the Polish Government to have a free government, but another part of our State Department, 10 days before that, unloaded \$24,000,000 of Polish assets onto the Polish Communist Government so that they would have \$24,000,000 to spread communism among the Polish people, telling them that the American Government wants the Communist Government to win.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has expired.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman has made a much better speech than I could. I am glad he completed his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if they had a regime in Poland representing the Polish people I would be for lending them every possible aid, but everybody knows that the people of Poland are under the heels of a commissar, a Communist regime that is grinding them into the dust.

If you will turn back and read an article that came out the other day about the 14,000,000 slaves in Communist Russia, you will find this statement:

Here, for example, is a part of the testimony of one Polish prisoner who had formerly been a judge. Here is what the judge said: "Half naked, barefooted, half alive, we arrived in the icy and deserted tundra where there was but a stick with a board nailed to it bearing the words 'Camp Point No. 228.' We ate rye flour mixed with water—uncooked. At night we slept in dugouts, lying close to each other for warmth on wet branches spread out on the mud."

Then he goes on to tell of the horrible treatment these slaves receive. He said:

Many died each night in the camp, and orderlies would tear the clothes off the bodies and then drag them to the morgue, a primitive barn made of sticks and branches where piles of corpses lay.

I am for the Colmer amendment for the simple reason that in my opinion this money will go into the hands of those Communist dictators just as the money and the supplies did that went to Russia. They have distributed them and lied to the people about where they came from. Communist Russia never gave America any credit at all for the things we sent to Russia.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Does the gentleman know that 50 percent of the children of Poland have tuberculosis?

Mr. RANKIN. And they will die of starvation if we depend on the Communist regime to feed them.

Mr. SADOWSKI. They will certainly starve to death if they have to depend upon you and Mr. COLMER.

Mr. RANKIN. No; we have been more charitable than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] by a heck of a sight.

I am opposed to any Communist regime or any Communist-dominated regime anywhere in the world.

Let the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House go into these matters and let the State Department or the administration break with this Communist dictator, this criminal that now has his heels on the neck of the people of Poland and then we can deal with the people of Poland themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think the evidence that has been presented here today will show you that we now have a bill before us which authorizes the Government of the United States to make contracts with Russia for relief, and with Russian-dominated countries for relief. Within a few days we shall have before this House a pro-

posals to send some three or four hundred million dollars of relief and armaments to Turkey and Greece in order to equip them to fight Russia.

I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin when he said that is double dealing, double talk. Unless amendments similar to the Colmer amendment are put in this bill, unless we can have United States supervision of these relief matters, food stations, clothing, whatever it may be that is sent, and unless the relief is withheld from Communist Russia and Communist-dominated countries I for one shall vote against the bill and take my chances with the good people of my district.

I do not propose to involve my taxpayers and my bond buyers in financing any such double dealing now or at a later date.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I wish to ask the gentleman from Michigan the same question I asked the gentleman from New York yesterday: Does the gentleman feel that this measure is necessary for our common defense and for the welfare of the United States?

Mr. CRAWFORD. To finance Russia? No. To finance Russian-dominated countries? No. To put relief in the hands of Russian-dominated governments to drive the people into their camp? No. I shall not vote for any such relief at any time; and because I do not believe such is for the common defense and for the welfare of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My amendment would prevent the giving of relief to Russia itself.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, but what about the Russian-dominated countries? If we could ascertain the facts we would find millions of people behind the iron curtain in Russia who are opposed to the Communist Government now controlling and often liquidating the Russian people. My heart goes out to them, but I will not fight my enemy and feed him at the same time. I will fight him, but I will not feed him at the same time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say that the gentleman speaks the sentiments I have so far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman vote for relief for Germany?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly, because we are dominating Germany. We are dominating and occupying Germany and of course I would vote to feed the Germans over which we exercise such control.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman is for relief for Germany but he will not vote for relief for the Polish people.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Poland is under the Russian heel. No one knows that better than the gentleman. Why should I put money and food in the hands of the Russian group in Poland to drive the Polish people to go along with Russia and against us?

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is not the gentleman's reason.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, yes. The gentleman should not try to sell me his bill of goods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the arguments for and against the Smith amendment, the Colmer amendments and the Mundt amendment and the general debate on this House Joint Resolution 153, to provide relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war. Among the six countries specifically named by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin we find Poland, and we find great opposition contained in the Colmer amendments to relief to that particular war-torn country because it is admittedly a Communist dominated country, in spite of elections in January.

I am constrained to remark that there is no necessity this year to adhere to the usual custom in the House of holding exercises commemorating May 3, known as Polish Constitution Day—so many friends of the Poles expressed themselves so succinctly and so unqualifiedly here on the floor of the House during these past few days and have indicated their sympathy for these freedom-loving, freedom-seeking and for freedom-dying peoples as is manifested in their history.

From my background, from letters I have received from Poland, from statements of representatives of relief organizations operating in that country, I know that there is great distress and need of care, especially for the undernourished children. General conditions make continuous care mandatory in order to survive. Insufficient food is causing great loss of life due to exhaustion by the workers, thousands upon thousands of whom are physically weakened from the years in concentration or other work camps.

Relief can be gotten to these needy in Poland without being stolen and can be safeguarded by the administrators the same as private relief organizations who are presently doing such magnificent, though far short to be fully effective, work in that country due to their own limitations of supply.

This bill is a humanitarian measure and concerns underfed, undernourished, and starving peoples of countries devastated by war. General Eisenhower said there was no greater devastation in any capital city than Warsaw. This being so, Poland should be included in the countries to which this relief will be given and for that reason I shall vote against the Colmer amendments.

AID TO POLAND

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will we give aid to the hungry peoples of

Poland? That is the question now before the Congress. I say that the Polish people are more entitled to assistance from this Nation than the peoples of any other foreign nation. It was the Polish people who first fought the Nazis—and they fought the Communists at the same time. In thus carrying the torch for freedom and democracy against the dictatorial hordes of Europe and Asia they served the freedom-loving peoples of all the world. They did so at the expense of despoiling their own land. In the aftermath that followed no nation was despoiled as Poland was despoiled and no peoples were persecuted as the Poles were persecuted. Why? Because they had the courage to fight for the same ideals of freedom that the United States has advocated for over 170 years. I plead with you to adopt no amendment that would interfere with our attempt to feed the starving remnants of a Poland whose courageous fight against dictatorship in the face of insuperable odds equaled that of the bravest nations in history.

DO NOT AID COMMUNISM

There are those who say this will aid communism—but there are adequate provisions in this bill to protect us from aiding communism. We propose to help feed those starving in Poland and we propose to tell the Polish people who is feeding them. That will not aid communism—it will fight communism for it will show the Poles that we are their friends.

POLISH PEOPLE ARE NOT COMMUNISTS

The Polish people are not Communists, they are Christians of the most devout type. They abhor communism, they detest it. We should help them as a nation get back on their feet. We should help them become a strong nation. Then as a nation they will throw off the Communist fetters that presently have some control over their government. We can today help them fight communism by voting in support of this bill to feed their hungry deserving people.

With the humanity for which we as a people are famous I am sure you will not fail to respond to the needs of our courageous allies in Poland by voting in their support. Your vote for this bill will be cast on the side of God.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a hungry stomach knows no politics. It seems to me it would be a short-sighted policy to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi denying absolutely any relief to the people of a so-called Communist-dominated country. In the first place, there is the difficulty of defining this term, but more important and fundamental than that is the humanitarian and, indeed, as I see it, intensely practical proposition that in Poland and Hungary, the two countries here chiefly concerned, the destitute and starving people whom this great Nation seeks to help, are just as hungry, just as cold, and just as sick, and just as much in need of food, clothing, and medical supplies as those in other countries whose politics do not follow the Communist line.

Ambassador Lane, recently returned from Poland, and other authorities, tell

us that not over 10 percent of the people in that devastated country want a Communist government. Ninety percent must bow to the will of this small clique because force so dictates.

In Hungary in the recent elections, only 5 percent voted for Communist candidates, 95 percent registering their courageous protest against the regime.

If we deny to these vast majorities in these two countries any relief when we are extending it to their stricken brothers in neighboring countries, it will be a demonstration to them, not of the warmth of our generosity, but of a cold and purely political approach to the problem of human suffering.

It is not necessary for me to restate my position on communism. It is well known to this body and to the people in my district, but I do say to the House that the way to fight communism is not only frontally, but also, and perhaps more important, by demonstrating to those who have embraced or are about to embrace this ideology, that there is a better idea, there is a nobler philosophy, known as democracy, which has its roots in Christianity.

It is argued that if relief is denied in these so-called Communist-dominated countries they will rise up in revolution against those in power and overthrow them. My answer to that is that it is far more likely to win adherents to the cause and principles in which we believe for these people to see the essential difference between those who would deprive them and those who would succor them. It would be, in my judgment, a tragic mistake for us to allow ourselves, because of our justifiably embittered feeling about communism, to be swept off our feet to take action which not only is violative of humanitarian principles, but is also against our own enlightened self-interest.

I am aware of the duty which we owe to those who must foot the bill for this relief. Much as my heart might dictate charity, I would feel hesitant to vote for the measure before us, were I not entirely convinced that it is essential to the pattern of our country's defense and the role of world leadership which, whether we wish it or not, is now ours. I favor every type of safeguard to insure that this food and clothing be not used, as it was so frequently in the UNRRA days, for political purposes. We must not turn it over to any of these countries to parcel out to their friends for votes.

There are many safeguards already in this bill directing relief to be stopped when it becomes apparent that such abuses exist, permitting our representatives to go into these countries and see what is happening, and allowing the press and the radio to report. I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota which will say, in effect, that in any case where it is considered necessary, an American mission may go in to supervise in detail the distribution of these supplies. I think that is only reasonable and we should insist upon it to be sure that our objective to alleviate hunger, nakedness, sickness, and human suffering is achieved and that the taxpayers' dollars are not wast-

ed. I believe the vast majority of the American people, when these protective provisions are written into this law, will wish to share their plenty with these desperately needy in the war-devastated areas.

I favor naming the countries where this relief is to be extended, with an emergency provision for a small amount to be expended if some pestilence or sudden catastrophe should arise elsewhere. I agree with those who say we should not write a blank check.

I understand an amendment is to be offered to permit a portion of this relief fund to be turned over to the Children's Fund which was recommended by ex-President Hoover in his testimony. One who has been seen, as I have, tragically thin little children in three of these countries concerned, in the raw days of December, their little hands purple with the cold, collecting faggots or picking over an ash heap to find some half-burned clinkers from which they could extract a few flickering grains of heat, could not fail to support this permissive amendment.

It is also my understanding, that in some of these countries it is intended to sell a part of these supplies. In other words, they will not entirely be distributed to the destitute, but some of them may be sold to those who can afford to buy them. Anyone who can pay, should do so. It is, of course, a fact that in some of these countries there is such a shortage of actual goods that even those with money to pay for them simply cannot get them. If any of these supplies are sold, we should require that funds derived from such sales be held in a separate account which can only be used for relief and rehabilitation under the approval and scrutiny of United States representatives.

There is probably one place where we must draw the line on relief. The people of this country should not be required to put up money to supply food and clothing to the people of the country which is paying out reparations under treaty. My understanding is that this situation applies only to Hungary and that an amendment will be offered to meet that situation. The treaty with Hungary has not yet been ratified by the Senate. Such an amendment will not deny relief to Hungary, as I should not wish to do, provided the Senate does not ratify the treaty. On the other hand, I am informed that Hungary is scheduled to pay \$23,000,000 a year to Russia in reparations. The people of this country will not, I believe, support a decision which means that the food and supplies which we pour into a country are to be taken out at the other end by Russia. The way to meet that situation is by denial of ratification to an arrangement which imposes such a burden on a nation struggling to survive.

Under the safeguards which have been and will be written into this proposed bill by way of amendment, I shall support the measure. My heart, my conscience, indeed, as I see it, the welfare of my country would not permit me to do otherwise.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, I desire to associate myself with the views of my colleagues the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] and the gentleman from Connecticut. It seems to me that it would be fatal strategy, at this juncture of our affairs, to confess defeat of our democratic ideas in Poland and Hungary, and abandon those grand peoples to the tender mercies of the Communist regimes imposed by Russia upon them. I believe that our concept of human freedom burns in their hearts; we must not fail them or appear to abandon them in this dark hour of their affairs.

And at the same time I want to mention here again Czechoslovakia, as I did earlier in the day, as a country excluded from our interest and support only because, by their own enterprise and devotion, they have made greater progress in the restoration of normal conditions than some of their neighbors have been able to do. I regard Czechoslovakia as the most hopeful of the central European countries now under the shadow of Soviet influence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, this debate develops the almost insoluble problem, moral as well as economic and political, that confronts us and the world. I am afraid that we will not be able to solve it here today. I wish I were as sure as some of my brethren seem to be here today of their position. However, I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], which, I think, will obviate, in some degree, at least, the almost insoluble difficulty of distribution which confronts us.

Our whole instinct and desire in this legislation is to relieve suffering, avert death and starvation and disease of people who are innocent. How to do that and at the same time avoid subsidizing the Soviet Government, which is the incarnation of everything, in my judgment, that is evil, is a problem that I do not believe we are going to solve here today. If by adopting the Mundt amendment we will make it possible for wise and strong representatives of the American desire and purpose to go into the individual communities and deal at first hand with the people who are suffering and in need, making their actions conform with our standards, then I am for the Mundt amendment, and I think it will go a long way toward solving the problems confronting us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk reread the Mundt amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read it.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Mundt amendment to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the Colmer substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Colmer substitute as amended by the Mundt amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. So that we can clear up the situation, may I inquire of the Chair if it is not true that if we should now vote down the Colmer amendment it would also vacate the amendment which we just approved so overwhelmingly?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OWENS. Is it not also true that if we vote for the Colmer amendment we have automatically put out the Smith amendment? That was the original amendment. The Colmer amendment is a substitute. If we now vote for the substitute we do not have the Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In that event we will still have to vote on the original Smith amendment as amended by the substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would not be helpful to get unanimous consent to have the Clerk read the Colmer amendment as it will read now with the Mundt amendment attached thereto? I so move.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the Mundt amendment has just been read. I will not object to the Colmer amendment being reread, but I do not see any use in having any others rereported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman objecting?

Mr. RAYBURN. I object.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENDER. Should we not have the Smith amendment read now?

The CHAIRMAN. We are not ready for that. It would not be in order at this time.

Mr. COLMER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. In order to clarify the matter, is it not true that the present parliamentary situation is that the Mundt amendment to the so-called Colmer substitute has been adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. And that if the Colmer amendment is now adopted, that would leave out the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. We would have to vote on the Smith amendment as amended by the substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot believe that our former Speaker wants to decline the opportunity for the House to act intelligently on this matter. We are in a parliamentary tangle, and I wish, on reconsideration, he would permit the substitute as amended to be read to the House so that we can vote intelligently.

I ask that the former Speaker extend that courtesy to the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am going to extend that courtesy, but I am going to object to any more speeches being made on one side or the other of this question under the guise of a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota that the substitute amendment as amended be read?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. COLMER for the Smith of Wisconsin amendment: On page 1, after line 8, add a new sentence, as follows:

"Provided, That none of the funds authorized to be appropriated herein shall be expended in or used for such relief assistance in those countries whose governments are dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics unless the governments of the countries covered by this amendment agree to the following regulations which are hereby declared to be applicable to every country receiving aid under this act.

"The State Department shall establish and maintain out of the funds herein authorized for appropriation a relief-distribution mission for each of the countries receiving aid under this act. This relief-distribution mission shall be comprised solely of American citizens who shall have been approved as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These missions shall have direct supervision and control of relief supplies in each country and when it is deemed desirable by the American authorities administering the provisions of this act these relief missions shall be empowered to retain possession of these supplies up to the city or local community where our relief supplies are actually made available to the ultimate consumers."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be read at this time so that the House may have the full picture.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 1, at the end of section 1, add the following:

"Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and China; *Provided*, That the President, if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other country or countries, is authorized to utilize not more than \$15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other country or countries."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that the adoption of the Colmer amendment would automatically defeat my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That would be the effect of it.

The question is on the Colmer substitute as amended by the Mundt amendment.

The Committee divided; and there were—ayes 127, noes 104.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. EATON and Mr. COLMER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 135, noes 110.

So the substitute amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now occurs on the Smith amendment as amended by the substitute.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand the amendment that was just voted on, as amended by the Mundt amendment, was a substitute for the Smith amendment. Then, why do we vote on the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That was the original amendment.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I make a point of order against the request for a division. It came too late. The vote was announced. The result was announced and the decision of the Committee was announced. Therefore, the request for a division comes too late. That is my point of order.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, on that point of order I would like to be heard. There was confusion all over the Chamber. I was seeking recognition to ask for a division. The fact that it was announced prior to that has no bearing upon the point at all.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was not recognized for that purpose. The whole thing was decided and the vote was given and there was a pause. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say further, Mr. Chairman, that the Chair paused for an appreciable period of time, after the decision of the Committee was announced by the Chairman, and no demand for a division was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The purpose of any vote is to ascertain fairly the judgment of the parliamentary body, and we have not passed on to the consideration of any other business. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I make the point of order that the House is out of order in voting on the Smith amendment after the Colmer substitute had been agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. RAYBURN. Permit me to say we have followed the rules of the House, even under the greatest stress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thanks the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read that on which we are now voting by division.

The CHAIRMAN. The Smith amendment as amended by the Colmer substitute.

Mr. BLOOM. The Smith amendment was read before.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state the question that is before the Committee.

The question is on the Smith amendment as amended by the Colmer substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 136, noes 72.

So the Smith amendment as amended by the Colmer substitute was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. As I remember it first there was a Smith amendment, then the Colmer amendment substituted, then there was an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] which was an amendment, not a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. FULTON. Then we passed the Mundt amendment and then voted on the substitute as amended; so there was then no other amendment to be considered because as soon as the substitute as amended was agreed to there was no original amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Not under the parliamentary procedure of the House. The Smith amendment had not yet been disposed of.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: Page 1, line 8, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That from the sums appropriated pursuant to this section the President may make contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations for the special care and feeding of children, and such contributions shall not be subject to the limitations and requirements provided in this joint resolution, but after \$15,000,000 has been so contributed, no further contributions shall be made which would cause the aggregate amount so contributed by the United States, (1) to constitute more than 57 percent of the aggregate amount contributed to said fund by all governments, including the United States; or (2) to exceed \$50,000,000, whichever is the lesser."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that if he will change his amendment and provide for sending it through the International Red Cross I will be glad to support his amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will listen carefully to the ex-

planation of the amendment. It authorizes support by the United States to the International Children's Emergency Fund which was unanimously adopted by the first General Assembly of the United Nations meeting in New York last December. Its purpose is to provide assistance for three main groups, needy infants, undernourished children, and nursing mothers.

President Hoover in his testimony said that he particularly favored "aid to the United Nations project for the special feeding of subnormal children." Now, this fund has already been set up and if the gentleman from Mississippi will listen, I will advise him that the man already appointed to be its Director is Mr. Maurice Pate who served with Mr. Hoover in the American Red Cross after World War I. He served also as President of the Polish Relief Commission from 1939 to 1941. He has been director of the American Red Cross in charge of relief to prisoners during World War II. So we are sure that the fund will be managed by one who has been working under the Red Cross all these years and has the highest qualifications.

A unique feature of this organization is that it does not operate by giving its food to the governments of the various countries in which it works. It maintains title to its relief supplies from the time they are procured here in the United States or elsewhere until they reach the ultimate recipient. The distribution will be handled and controlled by people who have been carefully trained and who have had long experience in the work of the American Red Cross.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Then why not let the Red Cross handle it?

Mr. JUDD. Because the American Red Cross, first, is not in a position under its charter to carry on relief in areas for which our Government does not have specific responsibility as we do, for example, in Japan and western Germany. Furthermore, there are many real advantages in doing this on a cooperative basis under the United Nations, if we can do so without the abuses and bad results we had under UNRRA, which there is every reason to believe we can. We know what the administration of this children's fund is going to do. It will not be welfare work such as we had during the depression. It will be hard-headed efficient relief such as Hoover gave after World War I, and such as Red Cross experts have always given. It will bring relief to the groups in a population whose need is greatest, most urgent, most immediate.

The Members of the House are divided with respect to this whole joint resolution. Some are in favor of the resolution, but they may be against this amendment because, they say, we should have a separate bill after awhile for \$50,000,000 or some such sum for the children's fund. I hope those Members will carefully reconsider before they vote against this amendment. I am

afraid that if they do not vote today to authorize the President to make contributions from this general relief appropriation to the children's fund, a separate bill may not be taken up for weeks or even at all. Let us at least do this much now. If need for more in a separate bill is demonstrated later, this will not prevent action then.

My amendment provides that the President may, if he wishes, contribute to the emergency children's fund up to \$50,000,000 of the sum authorized in this joint resolution. It is provided further that he can make initial contributions of \$15,000,000 to get the work going right away. We have to get help to those children in the next few critical weeks. He cannot make additional contributions from the total of \$50,000,000 authorized until other nations have come through, so that the aggregate amount ultimately given by the United States will not exceed the 57 percent which has been assigned to us as our share and in no case will it exceed a total of \$50,000,000.

Those who are in favor of House Joint Resolution 153 will, I hope, vote for this, and then we will make sure that those who need it most will get help. On the other hand are those who are opposed to the whole joint resolution. You, too, should vote for this amendment, because if the joint resolution does pass, as I hope and am confident it will, you will thus make sure that such money as is given will go to the place where there is reason to believe it will have the greatest chance to do the most good. Surely, whatever else we cut down on we cannot cut down on hungry babies and children and nursing mothers.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If you want the hungry children of Europe to get this money, do not send it through the Tower of Babel, but send it through the American Red Cross and the International Red Cross, and it will feed 10 times as many children as you intend to do.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I am in great sympathy with the gentleman's amendment, and I think something should be done. But, I would like to have the gentleman clear up this one thought: What is the difference between the \$15,000,000 that the gentleman speaks of and the sum of \$50,000,000 that he speaks of? I would like to have him explain that to the Committee so we will understand where the difference is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Let me say to the gentleman from New York, that if we were just to provide, as did the resolution I

originally offered in committee, that not more than 57 percent of the aggregate amount raised for this International Children's Fund under the United Nations should be given by the United States, we could not move until the others had moved. I believe the President of the United States should be able to make an initial contribution of up to \$15,000,000 to this fund to help get it going. Then, any additional contributions by us would be dependent upon whether others make a similar contribution.

Mr. BLOOM. When the gentleman speaks of 57 percent does he mean 57 percent of the \$610,000,000?

Mr. JUDD. No. I mean whatever special fund is raised for the children. We will give up to 57 percent, but not to exceed a total of \$50,000,000.

Mr. BLOOM. But we only obligate ourselves for \$15,000,000 first.

Mr. JUDD. Yes. We authorize \$50,000,000 if others contribute their share. But even before others contribute their share we authorize the President to contribute \$15,000,000 to this fund to help get it started quickly.

Mr. BLOOM. I think the gentleman has a very good amendment there and I am for it 100 percent.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman for his approval.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to ask the gentleman if the money which is taken from this fund that has been provided here would not be taken out of the distribution by this Commission which has just been provided for by another amendment and placed in the hands of an international organization?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; it would be. The money authorized in this amendment would be given to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations, which is already set up. If I had time I would like to read from their resolution. It is very carefully and explicitly drawn. The executive board of the fund has representatives for a great many countries. It has laid down its policies for administration of relief and they are just as strict, in fact, some are more strict than are the limitations with respect to race, creed, political belief, and that sort of thing, in the joint resolution we are considering.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman have in mind limiting the \$15,000,000 to orphan children?

Mr. JUDD. No; the assistance goes to all needy children.

Mr. O'HARA. What about the children of Communist parents? How are you going to separate them?

Mr. JUDD. They will not be separated, the administrators are in charge of the relief until it goes to the ultimate consumer so that the child of Communist parents will get neither more nor less than his need entitles him to. The

main work of the fund will be to give one feeding a day to these children, so there will be at least once a day that they will get something nutritious to eat. It is hoped to get up to 600 calories in that one meal. I certainly would not withhold Minnesota powdered milk from a half-starved child just because the parents are Communists, or perhaps profess to be in order to live.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is a general impression in this country that the Soviet Union has in the United States a great many agents spreading the Communist ideology among our people. I think that impression is well-founded.

I should like to ask this question: Where does the Soviet get its money to pay its agents for doing this work? In 1933 the President of the United States officially recognized Communist Russia. The quid pro quo for that courtesy allegedly was discontinuance by Russia of Communist promotional activities in the United States. Only the naive believed the agents of the Comintern would be withdrawn from the United States. At about the time recognition was given Russia, the Congress of the United States passed the Gold Reserve Act and raised the price of gold from \$20 to \$35 an ounce and authorized the Treasury to purchase gold at the increased price from any country that offered to sell it to us in unlimited amounts. The United States bought more than \$700,000,000 of gold from Japan and paid for that gold with scrap iron, oil, airplane parts, and so forth, which Japan later threw back at us in the form of bullets and bombs.

The Treasury also bought gold in large amounts from Russia. With the credit provided by that gold the agents of Stalin were amply provided with the funds to carry on their activities in this country. Bear in mind that this is the source of the means by which Stalin has operated in the United States of America.

I wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury a few days ago and asked him whether the Treasury still favors purchasing gold from Russia. His answer was in the affirmative, which means that the administration favors continuing the policy of providing the funds for Stalin to carry on his communistic activities in this Nation. It means precisely that and nothing less.

What, I ask, is our foreign policy? Where do we stand? It is being proposed on the one hand that we deprive Russia of the facilities for Communist expansion in Europe, Asia, and other parts of the world, while on the other hand we continue through gold purchases from her to supply her agents with a vast amount of funds to carry on her communistic activities in our country.

I am not one of those who believe communism can be stopped by war or foreign grants of money. I am only pointing out the utter inconsistency of the present policy of pouring money into Europe and elsewhere to stop commu-

nism while at the same time supplying the means for its propagation here at home. Let me add, however, that if communism should overwhelm us, which God forbid, it will not be because it was foisted upon us from the outside but developed endogenously.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the leadership, which is anxious that we speed this relief bill onward, whatever relief it provides, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Dr. JUDD a question publicly. Dr. JUDD, as you know, this particular program of relief of \$350,000,000 is generally a program of relief for approximately six countries. This is separate from the children's fund program for relief which it was contemplated would come up later. This general relief program is for \$350,000,000, and the proposed program for the children has been an additional \$50,000,000. I want to ask you whether in your opinion you feel your amendment, by putting the children's relief under this fund, will cut the total amount that will be available for children in those countries in the overall picture?

Mr. JUDD. No. My honest judgment is that this is likely to increase the amount they will get because I am genuinely afraid, I will say to the gentleman, that if we do not take care of this now in this resolution, an additional resolution coming along later when we are in a legislative jam near the end of the session will not get enacted at all. I am afraid if we do not act here the children's fund may not get anything, or at least not in time to save many, many lives.

Mr. FULTON. Therefore, we are debating on this question on the basis that it will not hurt a later approach to the children's fund.

Mr. JUDD. If the need for more develops later and it is demonstrated, Congress can and I think will provide more money. But I want to make sure now that as much as possible of the money that is provided for in this joint resolution will go where the need is greatest.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I agree with what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] just said with reference to the amount for the children. I think it is imperative to do what is necessary now and not wait until later. I think this will help the whole proposition, and that is why I am following the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. FULTON. I am glad to have the gentleman's comments. I simply wanted to bring out this point so it would not come up later as an objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] seems to be a very, very good amendment. I wonder if by authorizing \$50,000,000 for the children's program we are not automatically cutting down on other relief and cutting it down to \$150,000,000 rather than authorizing \$200,000,000 as the bill now stands.

Mr. FULTON. That is a part of my question, whether it cuts the total amount of relief down.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not a fact that if we leave the children's fund out of this and decide to put through special legislation later for the children's fund, we can do that, but if we do not do something now, the President cannot do anything about any of it. The one important thing to do is to get this relief program going as soon as possible and not delay any of the different parts of it. If we want to take a second guess later with other legislation, we can do so.

Mr. EARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. Do I understand the language of this amendment to mean that in spite of any other restrictions in the bill this money shall be used as indicated in the amendment?

Mr. FULTON. No; it will come under the restrictions previously adopted by amendments here and which have been put in the bill by the committee.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not correct in the answer that he has just made. This money will be administered by the International Emergency Children's Fund. Its director has already laid down restrictions and limitations which are similar and in some respects even more strict, but are not identical with those we have adopted here. It cannot be handled under two sets of restrictions. For example, the conditions as to how credits are to be extended, and so forth are not applicable and should not be applied to contributions to the children's fund.

Mr. FULTON. I think the gentleman has made a real point. This children's fund then, is not under the particular restrictions of this bill. The funds are being taken out of the general relief program and a separate program is being made of it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I think the House would like this matter cleared up. Do I understand that this fund is to be used in Communist-dominated countries?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; it can be used in Communist-dominated countries the same as the rest of the \$200,000,000 which has already been voted can be used in Communist-dominated countries subject to restrictions such as I have already referred to.

Mr. BARDEN. What was the reason the gentleman objected to putting the same restriction upon the use of these funds that we placed upon the rest of the \$200,000,000?

Mr. JUDD. Because under the rules and regulations adopted by the management of the children's fund these essential restrictions have already been established. It has been in the process of organization since last December. This is to authorize our contributions to it to help it get actual field operations going. It, itself, adopted similar restrictions long before we came along.

Mr. FULTON. If this is not under the same restrictions as the rest of the bill and is a separate program, I believe it is cutting down the total amount of relief, and it may react against the children's fund later, therefore I think the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Fulton) there were—ayes 145, noes 10.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Strike out of section 1, lines 3 and 4 the following: "to the President not to exceed", and add after the end of section 1 the following:

"The President, by and with the consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Director, to be known as the Director of Foreign Relief, said Director to be paid a sum not to exceed \$15,000 per annum. The Director shall, in turn, appoint citizens of the United States, without any criminal record, and having no affiliation or membership in the Communist Party, to oversee relief in all countries needing such relief. These citizens to be paid the regular amounts according to their civil-service rating plus expenses while on duty abroad, and volunteers may be appointed at the discretion of the Director, and, if military or naval personnel, they shall continue to receive their regular pay and allowances as though on active service. All civilian persons appointed by the Director of Foreign Relief shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which shall certify to the Director of Foreign Relief their citizenship, criminal record, if any, and political background, and affiliations. Files shall be kept by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on all these persons and such files are to be available at all times to Members of Congress and all Federal officials acting in an official capacity."

Strike out section 2. (a) and substitute therefore the following:

"Under the direction of the Director of Foreign Relief, such relief assistance shall be provided in the form of transfers of supplies, or the establishment in this country of credits subject to the control of the Director, in such quantities and on such terms as the Director of Foreign Relief may determine; except that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948."

Line 17, page 3 strike out "President" and substitute therefore "Director of Foreign Relief."

Line 23, page 4 strike out "President" and substitute therefore "Director of Foreign Relief."

Line 3, page 5 strike out "President" and substitute therefore "Director of Foreign Relief."

Strike out "SEC. 6. The authority of the President under sections 2, 3, and 4, to the extent the President directs, be exercised by the Secretary of State."

Strike out "SEC. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this joint resolution," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. The Director of Foreign Relief shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this joint resolution."

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I want it to be clearly understood that it is in no way a reflection or criticism on the work of the committee. I was very happy to hear at the beginning of this debate one distinguished member of the committee make the statement on the floor of the House that he would like amendments, in fact, that the committee felt that the bill needed amending. This seems to me quite apparent as we have seen a good many amendments offered by members of the committee.

It seems to me that if we turn back the pages of history a little we can see that this country of ours did the most outstanding piece of relief and welfare work not so very long ago when Herbert Hoover took over and administered Belgian relief after World War I.

It is my thought that if we can pattern the administration of this relief as closely as possible on what was done at that time we would come a little nearer perfection. I regret that owing to the change in the times volunteer service is no longer considered very important. It has seemed more necessary that this should be put under Government, and that the Director should be paid.

I think we all object to the blank-check idea—I know that my people at home object to it; and that is another reason why I have tried to get away from that and have a Director appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate.

It also seems to me in view of the discussions on the floor of this House that it is very essential that this money be administered in these countries, and wherever it is administered, by reputable American citizens. That is why that requirement is also incorporated in this amendment. We have seen what can happen when our money and nothing else is sent abroad. We know of the fiasco in Yugoslavia and other countries. We must be careful, but we want to feed the starving.

An important point I want to make is that money alone is not charity.

Unless we are willing to send people over there to do this job, to see that our dollars go where they can do good, our intentions will not be accomplished. We can do harm with money if it is not properly administered.

The purpose of my amendment is simply the proper administration of the fund that we, the Representatives, are taking from the taxpayers. I would far prefer to see the American Red Cross

and kindred organizations go out and ask the people of the United States: "Do you want to give \$200,000,000?" And I think they would give \$300,000,000. I do not think we have the right to take their money to give to any charity. I never was taught to give away other people's money. It is one thing to lend money, but it is quite another thing to say: "I will take your \$5 and give it to a relief that I think needs it."

This is a welfare bill, nothing more nor less, and as long as it is going to be administered by the Government, let it be administered so that it really will do good and not result in feeding the armies of Tito or some other dictator in Europe.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey.

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I rise to oppose the amendment proposed by the gentlewoman from New York, because many of the things she has stated about her amendment are thoroughly sound, and the remarks she made in its support are remarks that many of us, I am sure, agree with and all should weigh carefully. As a matter of fact, I have an amendment to propose to section 6 which will provide an administrator to be confirmed by the Senate under the President. If the committee will study the structure of the gentlewoman's amendment, they will find that throughout this bill she has substituted "administrator" for the President, so that we would have an administrator negotiating with foreign countries as to agreements and as to the carrying on of other negotiations which are necessary under this bill. I believe that we should have an administrator, and, as I say, I have a brief amendment which I shall propose to section 6 patterned after the administrator amendment adopted in the Greek-Turkish bill in the other body. This particular amendment provides, however, for military personnel and for the complete substitution of an administrator for the President in the conduct of our foreign affairs in connection with relief, which I believe goes a little too far. On the other hand, everything that the gentlewoman has said could be stated in favor of an administrator to be placed under the direction of the President, to be provided in section 6 of the bill.

I hope the pending amendment will be defeated and the same administrative result achieved without changing the conduct of our foreign relations by an amendment a little later in the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is not the main purpose of the amendment which the gentleman will present, in case the amendment of the lady from New York is voted down, as I hope it will be, the recognition that the State Department is a policy-forming and not an administrative body? It was not set up to do administrative work;

it has not had much experience in that field. As a result, there has been excessive confusion in most State Department programs with which I have had contact. All of us know how difficult it usually is to find the man in the State Department who has the real authority and power in a given program. Each official refers you to another. We want to have a one-man head—one man responsible. We do not want this to be improperly administered. We want to have one man, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to be responsible, as Mr. Hoover was responsible after World War I, so that we can be sure it will be administered to the greatest advantage.

Mr. VORYS. That is true, but we do not want to supersede the President of the United States, so the entire splendid argument made by the gentlewoman would apply to an amendment which will be offered a little bit later. I suggest that this amendment be voted down, and that you will remember her splendid remarks when provision for an administrator is proposed at a more appropriate period a little later in the day.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: At the end of section 1, add the following:

"Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and in China."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in the belief that the majority of the Members of this House want it. The countries should be named. I believe that it would be a tragic mistake for us at this time to send word to these countries which are supposedly dominated by Communists that we intend to do nothing in their behalf. I do not believe that this in any way affects the so-called Colmer substitute, and it ought to be in this bill. We are faced with a situation that calls for relief. We want to give relief to these countries who are so desperately in need. Now we have the opportunity to do it.

I urge that the Committee at this time adopt this amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Would the gentleman be willing to restore to his amendment an amount, say, \$15,000,000, that could be used outside of the named countries? For instance, General Marshall has mentioned Trieste, where an emergency situation may arise. Would the gentleman be willing to restore that language to his amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman suggest an amount?

Mr. VORYS. I would say \$15,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my

amendment be corrected so as to include the sum of \$15,000,000 for the purposes named.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would then read, after the word "China":

Provided, That the President, if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other country or countries, is authorized to utilize not more than \$15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other country or countries.

Is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported now as it would read if unanimous consent were granted for the gentleman to modify his amendment, this not to be taken out of the gentleman's time?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: At the end of section 1 add the following:

"Appropriations authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for relief in Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and China: *Provided*, That the President, if he shall determine that emergency needs exist in any other country or countries, is authorized to utilize not more than \$15,000,000 for the purpose of providing relief in such other country or countries."

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I shall not object, I think the amendment together with the amendment to the amendment makes this bill incomparably better than it is now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but I have asked for this recognition not so much to oppose the amendment as to see if we cannot clarify the situation a little bit. I think we have seen enough confusion here in the House this afternoon, and now we are tossing around countries and millions of dollars as children do toys. I do not know how many countries are in need. I doubt if many Members of this House know the condition of the government in Austria. I doubt if we know the conditions in Trieste and the other countries that we now seem to name.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. **HERTER**. The countries that are named are those specifically named in the committee report, the State Department saying that relief will be limited to those countries.

Mr. **BARDEN**. Can the gentleman give me some idea of the type of government now existing in Austria?

Mr. **HERTER**. It is under military control.

Mr. **BARDEN**. Under whose military control?

Mr. **HERTER**. Russian, French, British, and our own, and there is a government that has been recognized, not by us officially, that is operating with a president and a chancellor.

Mr. **BARDEN**. What situation are we going to be in when we add this to the other amendments adopted?

Mr. **MUNDT**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I think I can answer the gentleman's question about the \$15,000,000.

Mr. **BARDEN**. I would yield to anybody who could clear it up.

Mr. **MUNDT**. As I understand the question, it is: Why is the \$15,000,000 made available to the countries not named in the bill? Is that correct?

Mr. **BARDEN**. That is one of the questions, yes.

Mr. **MUNDT**. I will be happy to try to answer that. It is because the bill originally is intended to cover the relief needs in war-devastated countries. There are other countries which were devastated by war besides those named herein. Trieste is a case in point, Czechoslovakia is a case in point, and Yugoslavia is another case in point. There are others. Fifteen million dollars of this amount is therefore made available in the amendment to the Smith amendment for some unforeseen emergency which might develop in those countries not named by Mr. **SMITH**, subject, however, to the Colmer amendment as amended by the Mundt amendment. This means American missions to distribute the relief wherever that is necessary to obtain the desired results.

Mr. **BARDEN**. Then the gentleman is sending this money to Czechoslovakia?

Mr. **MUNDT**. No.

Mr. **BARDEN**. Does the gentleman propose that part of it shall go there?

Mr. **MUNDT**. We propose to make this \$15,000,000 available should some unforeseen emergency, pestilence or something of that kind, develop, where we would be called upon to furnish relief to a country not named by Mr. **SMITH**'s proposed amendment.

Mr. **BARDEN**. I thought we took care of this situation fairly well with the gentleman's amendment and the Colmer amendment, and clarified this situation as to where we wanted the money to go.

Mr. **MUNDT**. That is correct.

Mr. **BARDEN**. Now, we come back and the gentleman presents the same argument that he presented on his amendment in support of this amendment.

Mr. **MUNDT**. I am not speaking for the Smith amendment. I am pointing out why the \$15,000,000 is added. I am supporting that part of the amendment, but I am not supporting the Smith

amendment. However, if it is adopted, as seems likely, I think the provision leaving \$15,000,000 free for emergency use elsewhere is essential. With that provision in it I see no great disadvantage in the Smith amendment, but I am not supporting it.

Mr. **BARDEN**. You are supporting \$15,000,000 worth of his amendment, but you are not supporting his amendment?

Mr. **MUNDT**. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. **BARDEN**. I find there is another gentleman who is just as badly mixed up about this as I am.

Mr. **BREHM**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BARDEN**. I yield.

Mr. **BREHM**. Can the gentleman ascertain why the bill was brought to the floor of the House in such a hodge-podge manner and why it was not written in committee where it should have been written instead of attempting to write it on the floor of the House?

Mr. **BARDEN**. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I am very much disturbed about the same thing. If we keep shaking this bill from one side to the other, I am not so sure but that we will not tear up its very foundations. I am sure every Member of this body will recall that we overwhelmingly defeated this proposition within the last hour.

Mr. **VORYS**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BARDEN**. I yield.

Mr. **VORYS**. Under the Colmer amendment and the Mundt amendment, we can go into Communist-dominated countries, provided certain regulations are carried out. However, it has not been suggested that we go into any countries that might be so described except two. This amendment makes it clear that we are not under any circumstances going into Yugoslavia, Byelorussia, Romania, and Bulgaria except that \$15,000,000 is left to the discretion of the President in the case of all the war-devastated countries in case some emergency situation should arise. But that will not be enough out of the whole amount to make very much difference. This makes it clear that Congress says we are not going into Russia itself, which is a war-devastated country, and which might conceivably receive relief even under the Colmer and Mundt amendment.

Mr. **BARDEN**. Is the gentleman in a position to say at this point that the countries named in this amendment are the only devastated countries in Europe which are in need and which are not communistically dominated? I am opposed to financing communism directly or indirectly.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. **BARDEN**. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BARDEN**. I asked the gentleman if you are in a position to say at this time

that the countries named in the amendment which is now pending are the only countries in Europe that are war devastated and in need and which are not dominated by Communists.

Mr. **VORYS**. Why, no.

Mr. **BARDEN**. Then, why go along with the amendment?

Mr. **VORYS**. The gentleman knows that Yugoslavia is a Communist satellite country. There are a whole string of other countries. But the point is in the matter of relief the United Nations and the State Department have said that no countries except the ones named in this amendment are going to be included. I quote from the hearings:

The following European countries appear to have need of outside assistance: Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, and Poland. It is anticipated also that China may have emergency needs.

Mr. **BARDEN**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me a few seconds of my time?

Mr. **VORYS**. The gentleman was taking the time that was reserved for the committee.

Mr. **BARDEN**. This time was granted me by unanimous consent of this body.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. **BARDEN**. The gentleman was late in his suggestion.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. **SMITH**].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **OWENS**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. **OWENS**: On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "that" and insert "that inasmuch as an emergency exists in certain countries of Europe and Asia which might affect the general welfare of our Nation."

Mr. **OWENS**. Then I go on and state: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated—

And so forth.

Mr. **EATON**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **OWENS**. Yes; I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. **EATON**. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **OWENS**. I do not think it will take that long.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to again read the amendment which I have submitted. Right at the beginning, that is the first paragraph, my motion is to strike out the word "That" and insert the words "That inasmuch as an emergency exists in certain countries of Europe and Asia which might affect the welfare of our Nation"—then proceed with the balance of the paragraph. This amendment goes to the constitutionality of the measure, and permit me to state

briefly the reason why I am submitting the same. Last week, and again yesterday, I heard a great deal of debate which brings very forcibly to the fore the statement that we have heard many times previously "that where we need light we have been getting more heat." But insofar as I am concerned it has left me very cold. I read through the entire record of the proceedings and also the report of both the majority and the minority members. While a great deal was said as to the need of certain of these nations of Europe and Asia for financial aid from us, particularly with regard to medical supplies, food, and the other articles which are mentioned in the bill, no constitutional reason was given for our gift of \$350,000,000, which I understand is to be the first of a series of similar grants which former President Hoover estimated would reach \$1,500,000,000 during the coming 2-year period. Our Supreme Court has repeatedly held that a gift to a foreign nation whether in cash, credit, or tangible property must necessarily involve also the congressional power to appropriate the public money of the United States raised by taxation and apply it for such purposes.

Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution invests Congress with the power to "levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense of the general welfare of the United States." It is now well settled that under this provision Congress may appropriate and spend money raised by taxes for the national welfare, and that congressional discretion in selecting the means therefore is extremely broad. I appreciate fully the great need of the peoples of these nations of Europe and Asia. I appreciate also that something should be done to help them, particularly a nation like Poland, for whom we actually entered the last war, because of the vicious attack made upon that nation. However, we should be willing to state clearly and succinctly without hesitation that our purpose is to provide for the common defense and the general welfare. If we cannot pass the bill on that basis, then it cannot be passed at all. Then, if we were to grant that gift of money to the foreign nations for that purpose, it is, in my opinion, our duty to take the money from the fund which would be appropriated for the armed services. I am sure that you feel as I do that it is time for us to lay aside the methods which have brought us into two previous wars whereby we slapped and side-kicked from the sidelines without taking honest appropriate action. If we feel that we are in danger from the Soviet Union, let us take a firm stand with that nation. Tell them frankly and courageously what we feel should be done in the matter. If we of Congress do this the people of the Nation are going to respect our action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I will take but a few seconds in speaking in opposition to this amendment for it does nothing but amend the preamble. It

does not change the content or the purport of the bill. It simply puts a price tag on this relief and tells the countries of the world that we are glad to help because we think it is going to pay off for us. I do not believe that would be appropriate. Certainly we have other obligations besides this one of selfishness in this matter. I urge that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that the report of the committee to this House is an official part of this record and that if that indicates a constitutional basis for the granting of this relief it is sufficient without any preamble to the resolution?

Mr. MUNDT. I think the preamble to the resolution at least does nothing to change the purport or content of the bill. I never have had too much confidence in the controlling influence of a committee report, but I am convinced that this bill will stand any constitutional scrutiny as written at the present time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Will the gentleman tell me where in the bill there is a statement of purpose?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; at the very beginning it reads:

This bill is to provide for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

That is the primary purpose of this bill.

Mr. OWENS. Will the gentleman admit that the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held that that is not sufficient in itself unless there is compliance with this section of the Constitution which I have read?

Mr. MUNDT. I am afraid I cannot recall all of the decisions of the Supreme Court here on the spur of the moment so as to answer your question, but certainly any Supreme Court that upheld our participation in UNRRA will uphold our participation in this all-American relief program.

I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman, because we are trying to finish this bill today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois?

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Under the direction of the President, such relief assistance shall be provided in the form of transfers of supplies, or the establishment in this country of credits subject to the control of the President, in such quantities and on such terms as the President may determine; except that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948.

(b) In carrying out this joint resolution, funds appropriated pursuant thereto may be used to pay necessary expenses related to the providing of such relief assistance, including expenses of or incident to the procurement, storage, transportation, and shipment of supplies transferred under subsec-

tion (a) or of supplies purchased from credits established under subsection (a).

(c) Sums from the appropriations made pursuant to this joint resolution may be allocated for any of the purposes of this joint resolution to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government and such sums shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the department, agency, or independent establishment, or organizational unit thereof concerned, and without regard to sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529).

(d) When any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government receives request from the government of any country for which credits have been established under subsection (a) and receives, from credits so established, advancements or reimbursements for the cost and necessary expenses, it may furnish, or procure and furnish (if advancements are made), supplies within the category of relief assistance as defined in section 1 and may use sums so received for the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section. When any such reimbursement is made it shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Vorys: Page 3, line 13, at the end of section 2 insert the following:

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of the appropriations authorized by this resolution shall be expended for the procurement of relief supplies in countries other than the United States. The relief supplies provided under the terms of this joint resolution shall be procured and furnished by the appropriate United States procurement agencies unless the President shall determine otherwise."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment contains two suggestions made by Mr. Hoover which I understand are acceptable to the Department of State and are drafted in the language provided by Mr. Tyler Wood of the State Department who was with us during our committee discussions.

The purpose is to not have us spend our money outside of the country for supplies with the hope that other countries will come in and contribute supplies; if they find they can get money from the United States they might not be disposed so to contribute.

The other provision is that the procurement in this country shall be under the appropriate United States procurement agency so as not to have foreign countries, recipients of relief money, bidding for supplies in the American market. These are what might be called good housekeeping administrative amendments, and I believe that there is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, an hour or so ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and more recently the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. EARDEN] said that our thinking on this entire measure is muddled. I agree with them. Clear thinking requires facts and most of the facts behind this measure were marked secret and have never been communicated to us. We are not only writing blank checks, we are writing blank checks in the dark.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: Page 2, line 5, after the words "be made after", strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "December 31, 1947."

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I said in support of the first amendment reducing the \$350,000,000 to \$200,000,000, this amendment is complementary to it. If they had related to the same section I would have offered them simultaneously, but being in different sections I could not do that. However, all of the arguments which I made on behalf of the other amendment apply to this amendment.

There is a wealth of information, facts and evidence telling us that there will be no need for relief after 1947, that there will be no need for relief in these countries in 1948 except some of the members of the State Department say, "With the possible exception of Austria." Not the probable exception of Austria, but the possible exception of Austria. They may need some limited relief after that time.

Now, that is only a possibility. If that should occur there is enough in the bill for them to get some stuff into Austria to take care of the situation or, on the other hand, Congress will be in session again at that time.

Why should we insist upon ending this on December 31, 1947? As I said before, when we passed the last authorization for UNRRA in the sum of \$1,350,000,000, I offered an amendment at that time that the President should serve notice on UNRRA that we are withdrawing from UNRRA at the end of that time and there was a provision in the basic law that we should withdraw. Why? There must come an end to this relief. At some time we have to begin to whittle down. The amendment was defeated at that time, although the leadership said it was a very good amendment, that I should bring it up independently. I did not do that.

Mr. Chairman, we are giving the State Department, the administration, everything they ask for if we limit this to December 31, 1947. There is not a single word in the hearings against doing that and there is not a single word in the hearings that says that we should extend it beyond that date.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman feel that in case we accept his amend-

ment, and along about November it looks as if the money is not going to be needed, some excuse will be found for spending it anyway, so that it would be better to have it strung over the whole year rather than until December?

Mr. JONKMAN. No, indeed not. The Committee was informed that the \$350,000,000 was to last through the first crop year, and that is all they would need. We were given the same assurance, and this thing will drag on and on continuously otherwise. If there was any evidence whatsoever, if there was a scintilla of evidence of necessity to continue this through the fiscal year, there might be some argument, but there is none whatsoever, and at the same time there should not be any question in our minds whatsoever to adopt this amendment. Now is the time to do it.

Let me repeat: We are giving them everything they ask for. It is said here, for instance, that we are not strengthening the hands of our Secretary of State, General Marshall, if we cut it down. We are not cutting it down. It might even be that the date June 30, 1948, is merely a mistake, because the fiscal year ends at that time. There is no reason for it.

I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the House has already limited the amount to be expended to \$200,000,000. It now proposes to run exactly counter to its efforts at economy if it passes this amendment, for this reason:

The bill reads, on page 2, lines 4 and 5:

No such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948.

By the amendment it is sought to change that date and to provide that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after December 31, 1947. What will happen will be that all the credits will be established prior to December 31, 1947. The \$200,000,000 will be used up anyhow and the administration will be in here on the 3d of January 1948 with a new bill asking for more money, whereas if you defeat this amendment, at least you show your intention that the amount you are appropriating, reduced as it is, shall cover the period to June 30, 1948.

I respectfully submit that the amendment must be defeated if you are to be consistent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that those who are economy minded ordinarily attempt to stretch appropriations and authorizations as far as possible rather

than to limit the expenditure to a shorter time? That is the proposition involved here. I hope that we encourage the spreading of the appropriations and authorizations as far as possible rather than encouraging the speeding up of the spending of the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. No relief assistance shall be provided under the authority of this joint resolution to the people of any country unless the government of such country has given assurance satisfactory to the President that (a) the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, as well as similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, will be distributed among the people of such country without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; (b) representatives of the Government of the United States and of the press and radio of the United States will be permitted to observe freely and to report fully regarding the distribution and utilization of such supplies; (c) full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution; (d) if food, medical supplies, fertilizer, or seed is transferred or otherwise made available to such country pursuant to this joint resolution, no articles of the same character will be exported or removed from such country while it need therefor for relief purposes continues; (e) such country has taken or is taking, insofar as possible, the economic measures necessary to reduce its relief needs and to provide for its own future reconstruction; (f) upon request of the President, it will furnish promptly information concerning the production, use, distribution, importation, and exportation of any supplies which affect the relief needs of the people of such country; and (g) representatives of the Government of the United States will be permitted to supervise the distribution among the people of such country of the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: At the end of section 3 strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "(h) That when relief supplies procured with the funds authorized by this joint resolution are sold by any receiving government for local currency, the amounts of such local currency shall be deposited by that government in a special account and shall be used only for relief and rehabilitation purposes with the approval of the duly authorized representative of the United States."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I believe, is self-explanatory. It is, of course, obvious that most of these relief supplies—grain, and so forth—are going to be distributed in the countries through their regular distribution systems. This amendment provides that the money which constitutes the proceeds of the sale of these supplies shall be impounded in a special fund in the local currency and used only for

relief and rehabilitation purposes under the approval of the representatives of the United States. Similar arrangements were provided under UNRRA. We found that a similar proposition was going to be incorporated in the contracts to be made with the countries. This language in my amendment was drafted by a representative of the State Department. I do not believe there is now any objection to this provision.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not the intention of the gentleman that these funds that are recaptured in a country shall be used only for relief and rehabilitation in that particular country? Would not the gentleman accept that amendment?

Mr. VORYS. I feel that it would be better to leave the language as drafted because if the country involved and the United States representative agreed, conceivably, that some relief or rehabilitation should take place in another country and it could be financed by local currency, I do not think we should put in here something that would block that use of the money, although that is, of course, not required one way or the other. I do not think we ought to tie the hands of the administration by requiring that this money be expended for relief or rehabilitation in any particular spot.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not a fact that under the gentleman's amendment if funds were recaptured in Poland they could be used by this administration in Hungary? Then you have the question of foreign exchange and different currencies and all those problems.

Mr. VORYS. You would have the question of foreign exchange immediately, but if you can conceive of a situation where, let us say, in Italy as the result of the sale of American relief supplies the Government had an amount of lire on hand and could purchase something that could be used in another country needing relief, it seems to me we ought not to put in here anything that would prevent that sort of use of that currency. But the provision for impounding the local currency is such that I do not conceive that there would be many instances of that kind.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is not one of the purposes of this amendment to avoid any possibility of the thing that happened in Yugoslavia, where UNRRA sent in supplies and they were sold by Tito's government and he used the proceeds to pay more soldiers? We want the money that comes from the sale of these relief supplies to be used for relief purposes in their own country, if needed. There conceivably could be a case, for example, in Poland, which the gentleman mentioned, and which normally has agricultural products to export, where they would have a boom crop and surpluses. Under this amendment they would use the Polish currency from the sale of re-

lief supplies to buy their local agricultural surpluses to be delivered at the border of Hungary, for example, to help relieve starvation there, if it should exist. Maybe such an instance would not develop. But if it should, then this is a good safeguard to prevent misuse of the funds a government secures from the sale of relief supplies in that country.

Mr. VORYS. Certainly no such provision would be carried out unless the President and the administrator wanted to do it. I do not see why we need to tie the hands of the President in this regard.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, will not the gentleman agree to an amendment to his amendment to insert on the sixth line of his amendment after the words "relief and rehabilitation purposes" the words "within that country"? I think that will meet the situation. In other words, it allows everything that the gentleman proposes here, except it does not allow these recaptured funds to be carried from one country and used in some other country.

Mr. VORYS. I am in a position here of protecting the discretion of the President and the relief administrator. The gentleman wants to tie the hands of the President in advance, if the situation should arise where the United States representative under his direction would wish to ask that relief and rehabilitation be provided for some other country. I do not think it is necessary because I do not think many such situations would arise. But I do not believe we should bar that possibility.

Mr. RICHARDS. I shall not insist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may have three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. I believe the gentleman from Minnesota referred to the fact that in the event there were surpluses in Poland the money allotted for the Polish program could probably be used for the purpose of buying surpluses to use elsewhere. Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman did not understand correctly.

Mr. DINGELL. Certainly that is a desirable thing. Would that not go further to aid Poland in her reconstruction for the future?

Mr. VORYS. No; the gentleman is in error in this way. If supplies were furnished to Poland which were sold and which resulted in income in Polish money, then there would be a possibility if there were surpluses in Poland that money which is in Polish exchange could be used to buy Polish supplies and conceivably used elsewhere. But it seems to me that is making our dollar do double work, and it is a good idea.

Mr. DINGELL. I am in agreement with that. I do not believe we ought to subscribe to any amendment at this late moment.

Mr. VORYS. I agree with the gentleman. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I have followed this debate with much interest and with deep concern. I have been pleased to vote in favor of amendments specifying the countries to receive aid, such as Poland, and certain other countries, as well as to set up definite procedures to prevent American aid from being misused by Communist-controlled puppet governments. The debate thus far on the floor of the House has indicated, in my opinion, a desire on the part of the American people to help their less fortunate friends abroad and at the same time this debate has indicated a deep-seated conviction that the administration of relief funds in the past has been badly handled. This bill as written and as amended on the floor of the House does what it is supposed to do. It provides aid to the needy.

I rise at this point not to carry on that particular line of argument but rather to ask the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, a question which many of my constituents have asked me—Does House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of the countries devastated by war, further weaken the United Nations?

Mr. EATON. My answer to that is "No."

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will the gentleman please explain his answer in more detail?

Mr. EATON. My explanation is simply this: The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is an international organization and it ends shortly. The need developed after the ending of this. The matter was considered by the United Nations and our own representatives made this proposal, that from now on, in finishing the work that was left by UNRRA, we do it on a unilateral basis, and that was agreed to by the United Nations Authority. Consequently, it is not by-passing but is acting in accord with the understanding of the United Nations.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: In other words, the unilateral position, which the chairman has mentioned, throws the entire burden on the people of the United States, does it not?

Mr. EATON. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then, who else is participating in this relief program which is a perpetuation of UNRRA?

Mr. EATON. The amount proposed for relief was \$610,000,000. The United

States agreed to take 57 percent of that. We have backed away from that. Meanwhile, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have offered to come in and it is hoped that many others will do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What other countries are making a contribution to the \$350,000,000 carried in this bill? What other countries are making contributions?

Mr. EATON. Here is what the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted on December 12, 1946: A resolution urging the following performance of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration: Residual relief needs in such countries be made during the ensuing year, through the development of the respective programs of all members of the United Nations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the \$350,000,000 program here presented is the portion assigned to the United States?

Mr. EATON. Not assigned, but suggested.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, assumed by the United States.

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What portion is England assuming and what portion is Canada assuming and what portion is Australia and New Zealand assuming?

Mr. EATON. My latest advice is that the definite assumption of those nations has not yet been made, but they have given assurance that they will stand up and do their part in accordance with the suggestion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But as far as the record shows at this moment, then, the United States, through this \$350,000,000 or \$200,000,000 carries on the finishing up work of UNRRA?

Mr. EATON. But we have taken no definite position that unless the other nations come across and agree exactly as we have that we will quit.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is exactly the point. We carry on whether they drop out or not.

Mr. EATON. Well, the obligation that we assumed we consider is our obligation, and in assuming that we discharge our obligation and do not mix up with the obligation of the others.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. The only thing we can go on is the record, and here is the last word on it from Dean Acheson:

Question. What assurances or expectations do we have of assistance to the countries to be benefited from other countries than our own as contemplated by the program?

Answer. The British have announced a program of \$40,000,000 in aid to Austria.

I have already shown that is a straight loan; a sterling loan.

The Norwegian Parliament has voted the equivalent of \$3,000,000. Denmark is making available the equivalent of \$4,000,000. New Zealand has stated its intention to make available some meat and other commodities. On the basis of consultations which have been conducted with other countries we believe that additional contributions will

be forthcoming if favorable action is taken by the United States, since some countries are waiting to see what action we take.

Mr. EATON. And I may say the New Zealand meat will be largely horse meat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that the question just asked and the answer given, that other nations will not contribute, are an argument for more and not less money, as far as we are concerned?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The gentleman can reach his own conclusion on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. When supplies are transferred or otherwise made available to any country pursuant to this joint resolution, the President shall cause representatives of the Government of the United States (1) to supervise the distribution of such supplies among the people of such country, and (2) to observe and report with respect to the carrying out of the assurances given to the President pursuant to section 3.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact we do not know what the amendment is or how much we should debate it, I object to the request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LODGE:

Page 4, line 25, strike out the word "and."

Page 5, line 2, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and (3) make certain that reparations payable by any such country to any other country by treaty have been postponed during the period of such relief."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in effect, provides that treaty reparations shall be postponed during the period of this relief.

The purposes of this amendment are:

(a) To provide relief for Hungary in spite of armistice reparations imposed by Soviet Russia;

(b) To prevent the payment of reparations by Hungary;

(c) If this is not done, to postpone the payment of these reparations until Hungary has recovered from the ravages of war; and

(d) To protect the American taxpayer from making payments toward reparations while he is paying for relief.

In his testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee of this body, the for-

mer President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, remarked:

The nations receiving reparations from relief countries should be asked at once to defer reparations until these relief costs are repaid. The justice of this proposal lies in the fact that this relief obviously serves to preserve the manpower productivity of that country and therefore its ability to pay reparations (p. 56 of the hearings on H. J. Res. 153.)

I do not happen to believe that it is wise to require payment of the relief costs. It does not seem to me sound or feasible to require needy countries to borrow for relief such commodities as food, although it would appear quite proper to make rehabilitation and reconstruction items the subject of loans since these can be used in obtaining foreign exchange. But I do feel that the payment of reparations by such countries should be deferred while they are receiving relief.

The reason why this amendment refers specifically to reparations provided by treaty is because Hungary is, under the armistice provisions with Soviet Russia, currently paying \$23,000,000 a year in reparations, which reparations would have the effect of increasing the relief needs of Hungary. In reply to a line of questions of mine, Mr. Clayton, the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, stated in his testimony:

I want the record to be clear on this point: I am not informed that in the case of Hungary, reparations payments of \$23,000,000 a year are of a character which would affect its relief needs. We have taken that into account in making these estimates (p. 38 of the hearings on H. J. Res. 153.)

It seems to me unfair to deprive Hungary of relief because reparations have been forced upon her by Soviet Russia under the terms of the armistice. Shortly after the end of the war the Hungarians manifested their desire for a democratic form of government by a vote of 95 to 5. They should not now be penalized for their anticommunism.

But with respect to the future and particularly in view of the President's address to the joint session of Congress on March 12, it seems to me essential that the American taxpayer should not be burdened both with relief for countries devastated by war and with payments which would eventually constitute reparations to totalitarian countries. Indeed, our distinguished Secretary of State, General Marshall, has made this very clear in connection with the Russian desire to obtain German reparations payments from current production. General Marshall has indicated his unwillingness to transfer a substantial part of the burden of German reparations to the backs of the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to adopt the policy enunciated by the President, let us hew to that policy. No country can afford to follow two conflicting policies at one and the same time. We cannot successfully hunt with the hounds while we are running with the hares.

The problem of bringing relief through Communist-dominated puppet govern-

ments is at best a difficult one. Our experience with UNRRA left much to be desired. There will probably be grave difficulties in connection with this United States program. And yet I feel that we must not condemn to death by starvation those people who have been stalwart and staunch in their opposition to Communist pressure. We must endeavor to bring this relief to the needy and not to bolstering the black markets which abound under these Communist oligarchies.

But although this relief must go forward, it is entirely fitting that we should require that during the life of this legislation no reparations be paid since such reparations will increase the relief needs of countries to which we propose to bring relief assistance.

If this amendment is adopted, it will, in my opinion, have a most salutary and resounding effect. It will reassure the taxpayers of this country as to the expenditure of their money for relief in devastated countries. It will demonstrate our conviction that we played our full part in the recent war and that it is neither necessary nor appropriate that we now make additional payments by way of reparations. Finally, it will indicate to all the world that although we are bent on relieving suffering and starvation we are also determined not to assist the antifreedom forces which, in spite of the war's end, are still very much on the march.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments end at 5:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the Chairman have any idea how many more amendments there are?

Mr. EATON. I am advised there are two more amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. There are three on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. EATON. Does that include the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Including the pending amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I understand if we finish at half-past 5 there will be at least three roll calls. There are some who have to be at the White House this evening.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, of course, I do not know how many roll calls there will be, and I do not know whether anyone can make any determination about that, but certainly whether or not there are roll calls or how much longer it might take would involve a determination by the leadership as to whether we should continue tonight or not. But the limitation of time would simply bring us to the voting point on the bill.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Does our distinguished leader have any objection to this going over until tomorrow to be voted on?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know what the prospect will be in respect to voting, so I would not want to undertake to say about that. But, certainly, there should be no objection, if this is a fair limitation of time for the remaining amendments and the consideration of the bill, to conclude this evening.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, it seems to me there should be 10 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. EATON. There will be that amount of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. (a) The President shall promptly terminate the provision of relief assistance to the people of any country whenever he determines (1) that, by reason of changed conditions, the provision of relief assistance of the character authorized by this joint resolution is no longer necessary, (2) that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out, (3) that an excessive amount of any supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or of similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, is being used to assist in the maintenance of armed forces in such country, or (4) that supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, are being exported or removed from such country.

(b) Relief assistance to the people of any country, under this joint resolution, shall, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

Sec. 6. The authority of the President under sections 2, 3, and 4 may, to the extent the President directs, be exercised by the Secretary of State.

Sec. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this joint resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because I think it should be clear to the House exactly what this amendment means. A similar amendment came up before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and was voted down because the purport of the amendment—and I ask this in a form of a question of my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], with whom I am generally on the same side—the purport of this amendment is to endeavor to cause the Senate to reject the Hungarian Treaty which is now before it because if the Senate approved the treaty relief would not move to Hungary. Therefore, if the House votes for this amendment, what it is doing is saying that if the Senate ratifies the treaty no

relief shall move to Hungary. I ask the gentleman that question.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the gentleman that as the situation looks now my amendment would appear to include only Hungary, but, of course, Austria may be called upon to pay reparations, in which case it would include Austria. The case of Italy is different since reparations under the Italian treaty will be postponed 2 years, so that Italy is not affected.

I will say this, that at the time my amendment was voted down in committee, General Marshall had not yet returned from Moscow. We now know that he is opposed to the American people paying out a lot of money in reparations, and it is my hope that these treaties will be defeated in order not to visit these reparations on the American taxpayers and also on these people.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Did not General Marshall announce at Moscow the American principle that we are not willing in the case of Germany to pour in relief at one end while our former Allies take out reparations at the other, and does not that apply with equal force to the other peace treaties?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the House now has it very clearly that no relief will move to Hungary if the treaty before the Senate carrying Hungarian reparations is ratified, and that therefore the House would be saying that it wants a new Hungarian treaty if it adopts this amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Relief will go forward to Hungary. The gentleman prophesies that the Hungarian treaty will be ratified. I am inclined to think that the other body will not do so. In any event, I want relief to go to Hungary and I also do not want the Hungarians and, incidentally, the Americans, to have to pay reparations to Soviet Russia. That is the purpose of my amendment. It is to provide relief for the Hungarians and not to deprive them of it. It is to protect the Hungarians from onerous and unjust treaty reparations. It is to protect the American taxpayers from the burden of reparations while they are burdened with relief.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. May I ask the gentleman from Connecticut this question: Is it not a fact that the only ground upon which relief will not go to Hungary under the gentleman's amendment will be if the Senate ratifies the existing treaty?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct. I feel that a country which needs relief as badly as Hungary should not be called upon to pay reparations. My purpose is to protect the Hungarians from the loss of relief, from having to pay reparations, and at the same time to protect the American taxpayer.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. May I ask either of these gentlemen who are members of the committee how Great Britain can pay \$40,000,000 of this when she borrowed \$3,750,000,000 from us and is now retiring from Greece because she cannot bear the financial burden there?

Mr. JAVITS. I respectfully submit that the question is not germane to this discussion, the \$40,000,000 is a sterling loan of Great Britain to Austria.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 90, noes 37.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Vorys: On page 5, strike out lines 23 to 25, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 6. Relief assistance under this joint resolution shall be administered, to the extent the President directs, by a Relief Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall perform such functions relating to the administration of this act as the President shall prescribe. The Administrator shall receive such salary and have such staff as the President shall determine."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. In commenting upon the amendment offered earlier by the gentleman from New York, I think I described this amendment. This leaves the Administrator under the President, and does not attempt to substitute the Administrator for the President, but provides, as is provided in the Greek-Turkish relief bill in the form it passed the Senate, for a relief administrator to be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate and to conduct the relief administration under the direction of the President.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some talk to the effect that a Senate confirmation might involve some delay. The United States Senate has already confirmed 12,500 executive appointments this year up to April 15. I am sure that a good appointment will be promptly confirmed.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the Administrator, under section 4, in the supervision of the distribution of these supplies that are purchased with the money that is authorized here, see that the people of these devastated countries who are without food and money to buy the food can get some of this relief?

Mr. VORYS. That is provided in the specimen agreements which were submitted to the committee. The rationing system must not only provide for sale but for free rations for those who need it.

Mr. BARRETT. Who gets the preference—the man with the money or the fellow without the money to buy the food?

Mr. VORYS. As I stated, there is a minimum ration to be distributed, whether there is money available to pay for it or not. That is provided in the specimen agreements.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment simply substitutes for General Marshall another appointee by the President to be confirmed by the Senate. Not only is this a matter of foreign policy, but I wish to point out that we have General Marshall, a Cabinet officer, who has already been confirmed and who attends to these matters of foreign policy. I am convinced that today, particularly, would be a very unfortunate time to eliminate him by this bill and substitute anybody else for General Marshall just when he has returned from his mission to Moscow and made his report, as all of you know, last night. It seems to me that it would be quite unfortunate, as I say, to substitute anybody for him at this particular time.

Furthermore, this matter has been delayed entirely too long. I am afraid it is an unfortunate fact that because of that delay, some of which I thought was unnecessary although I may be wrong, many people are going to starve. Certainly when we already have an officer of our Government who has been confirmed by the Senate and is ready to act and who I think is acting excellently in foreign affairs, I cannot conceive of the idea of further delaying the matter to cause a confirmation by the Senate to be necessary, despite what my genial friend, the gentleman from Ohio, says about the 3,000 executive appointees having been confirmed. I call attention to the fact that we also had a Lillenthal confirmation debate.

One other thing, it is passing strange that although my friends on the other side have been talking about bureaus all these years and are still talking about them, you now want to create a new bureau to perform a function for which we already have someone who is quite competent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield gladly.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman knows that General Marshall is not going to administer this. According to a letter that we had from Acting Secretary Acheson, a man by the name of Mr. Dick Allen, formerly with the Red Cross, is the man who is proposed. If that man is as good as we are told he is, I have no doubt of his confirmation by the Senate. If there is something wrong with him, that is something else, but General Marshall is not going to administer this. We have already been told who is going to do it.

Mr. JARMAN. Of course, it would be administered in Europe. Undoubtedly that man would be appointed, I judge, from what the gentleman says, but why run any risk of further delaying this matter? Particularly as I say at this

time, why slap General Marshall in the face?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman wants to have anything in the nature of relief revert to the kind of administration we have got on this relief program out of the State Department under UNRRA? I think that is about as bad as anything that ever happened.

Mr. JARMAN. Under UNRRA we had a director, just as the gentleman wants now, as I understand it.

Mr. TABER. Not confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. RAYBURN. The same man who appointed him would have to appoint somebody else.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; the same man would appoint him.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not more necessary than ever today to synchronize our relief efforts with our foreign policy?

Mr. JARMAN. There is no question about that.

Mr. RICHARDS. The man who is to be in supreme charge of our foreign policy should be in supreme charge of relief.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. VORYS. My amendment leaves the man who is in charge of our foreign policy still with full responsibility over this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICHARDS) there were—ayes 120, noes 67.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: That House Joint Resolution 153 be amended by adding a new section thereto to be known as section 6 (a), which shall follow section 6 and precede section 7 of the resolution, as follows to wit:

"SEC. 6 (a). The officers or agencies authorized or designated to carry out the provisions of this resolution shall, wherever possible, administer said resolution in accordance with the following principles: That wherever possible dehydrated or dried foodstuffs shall be used, providing they meet the relief situation at the place where they are to be shipped, and meet the nutrition requirements of the people who are to eat the food. If consistent with these requirements foodstuffs of such types and kinds shall be used as may be helpful to our domestic economy."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of offering this amendment was to raise the problem of the administration of this act. I

am thoroughly in accord with the resolution and intend to vote for it, because in 1945 I made a trip with a subcommittee to Europe and learned by personal observation in what a chaotic condition the people of Europe live. I think I thoroughly understand the need for this sort of action but I think we should try in the administration of this act to mesh the welfare of the American economy with relief to the devastated areas and to the hungry people of Europe. I therefore mention the fact that where we can we should use dehydrated foods and we should use foods of which there are surpluses.

For instance, just to illustrate the point I am trying to explain, today there are on the market 4,000,000 pounds of dehydrated onions which the Army and Navy have turned back to the contractors who sold the onions to the services. The ratio of dehydrated onions to fresh onions is 10 to 1. That is, that each pound of dried onions was made from 10 pounds of fresh onions. There are therefore 40,000,000 pounds of this food now on the market and if we do not find some outlet for it, outside of our own country, the whole onion market this year and next will collapse and our economy as far as those raising or handling onions will be very badly damaged.

Then there are some dried fruits that are also in surplus. Here the ratio is about 1 pound of dried fruit represents 4 pounds of fresh fruit.

In the dehydrating of fruits and vegetables, none of the vitamins or nutrition of the fresh product is lost. All that is required is to soak the fruit or vegetable in water, and it is ready for cooking. In the shipment of this type of food it can be seen that only one-tenth or one-fourth of the space or weight is required to give the same number of vitamins or the same amount of nutrition, as if the fresh product were sent. The resultant saving in hauling charges, ships, labor, and so forth, is tremendous, but the starving people get just as much food.

My only purpose in presenting this amendment is to try to get a little common sense into the administration of this act, because we have had so many curious results and disappointments from the administration of these various relief programs. If there are surplus foods having the proper nutritional value and of the right kind for the area and people involved we should use them and thus help our economy.

The question I want to ask the chairman is this—and I have heretofore presented this amendment to the chairman: Is it the gentleman's understanding from the hearings that were held that the matter of administering this relief will be in accordance with the principles of the amendment I have offered, namely, that we will use foods that have the proper nutritional value, that are of the right kind for the people involved, and, if possible, use foods which are in surplus?

Mr. EATON. I may say in reply to the gentleman from California that that is the assumption upon which the committee has acted, that we have the best food available, procured in such way as

would be for the advancement of our own economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; your answer is appreciated and a good yardstick for administrators of this act.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield. Mr. SADOWSKI. Are these onions California onions?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Some are from California and some are from many other States. It is not a California matter, it is a humane matter, but of course we want these poor people to have the best, so, naturally, they should get some California fruits and vegetables.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment. The chairman's answer satisfies me.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, pursuant to House Resolution 187, he reported the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Jonkman amendment and also a separate vote on the Colmer-Mundt amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the votes on the amendments and the bill go over until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today certain editorials.

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL ACT OF 1947

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2157) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and in-

clude an article appearing in Sunday's New York Times magazine section.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow during general debate the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow during general debate the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to hold hearings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in reference to General Bliss.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GATHINGS (at the request of Mr. CRAVENS) for today and tomorrow on account of absence on official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] is recognized for 20 minutes.

RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I have long been troubled with the ultimate effect that the Reciprocal Trade Act will have on the industry of America and its labor force. When Congress extended this act in 1945 for an additional 3 years, and provided that tariffs might be

lowered by another 50 percent, we abdicated our control over tariffs and delegated all our responsibility to the executive department. It was for this reason that I then spoke against the passage of the bill and voted against it, and in the 2 years that have passed since then, during which I have given continuous study to the question, I have not changed my mind.

I represent the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, which comprises Atlantic, Cumberland, and Cape May Counties. This is the home of many substantial industries. Food processing and the manufacture of clothing is carried on extensively. Commercial fishing is of great importance. And primarily, so far as tariff questions are concerned, the district, particularly Cumberland County, is one of the most important producers of glassware in the United States.

There are today between 9,000 and 10,000 workers occupied in the production of glass products in this district. The glassware manufactured here varies from ordinary containers to intricate apparatus for laboratory use, and represents a sales volume between \$30,000,000 and \$35,000,000 per annum.

The actual labor involved represents from 25 percent of the cost of fully automatic machine-made containers to 89 percent in the production of glass apparatus for laboratory or industrial use.

The average hourly wages, on a basis of a 40-hour work week, range from \$0.985 to \$1.644.

During the past 10 years, wage rates have increased 107 percent for male workers and 135 percent for female help. The plant and equipment investment per worker averages about \$4,000.

I would like to say in passing that the labor relations in this industry in my district have been for the most part exceptionally good, and the combination of excellent management and high-grade workers made an important contribution of vital materials to the United States during the war.

This essential industry and other important businesses in my area are threatened by the power of the executive department to manipulate and decrease tariffs. The International Conference at Geneva, which began April 8, can spell the difference between the continuance and discontinuance of this and many American enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in the exclusion of foreign products, and I recognize the necessity of cultivating foreign trade, but there are some specified industries which by their very nature require reasonable and adequate protection; and require, in my judgment, that that protection be guarded and provided by the elected representatives of the people in Congress, and not by the State Department, which in its zeal to cultivate our foreign relations often neglects our domestic welfare.

It is for this reason that I have introduced a bill to restore to Congress at least the right of veto of tariff treaties which are harmful. I think the bill is necessary, and I hope it will have the

prompt attention of the Ways and Means Committee and of the House. It does not interfere with the international conference about to proceed, and it does not retard foreign trade. It merely restores to the Congress, where it rightfully belongs, ultimate authority over tariff questions, the protection of the American worker and American industry. The bill is brief, and reads as follows:

A bill to require approval by Congress of Executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same becomes effective

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the effective date of this act no Executive agreement which contains any provision for reduction of tariff rates shall become effective until such agreement shall have been filed for a period of 90 days with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and with the Secretary of the Senate. If during such period of 90 days the Congress shall, by joint resolution, disapprove the agreement, it shall not thereafter be executed and shall for all purposes be void.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution gives the Congress jurisdiction over the regulation of foreign trade, custom duties, and tariffs. When Congress passed the original Reciprocal Trade Act in 1934, as well as the extensions of that act, it abdicated its responsibility under the Constitution, and departed from a program which had been in effect in this country for many years.

It is my feeling that Congress should take action to restrain or delay the negotiating of reciprocal treaties which are about to be undertaken. If agreements are made now, they should be very flexible. World conditions are changing rapidly and trade agreements must reflect such changes.

If the United States is to help in mending a torn world, we must maintain a sound productive economy within our own borders. Domestic producers and manufacturers must be in a position to compete in the domestic market on an equitable basis with foreign products of similar character. An equitable tariff cannot be considered a barrier to trade; it has the opposite effect. Fair competition is stimulating to business. At this time nearly all of the other countries of the world with whom the treaties are to be negotiated have nationalized industry, and for us to believe that the free enterprise of this country can compete with nationalized industry in other countries is fantastic, unless adequate safeguards are provided. Before negotiating treaties we should have definite assurances as to wage scales that are going to be maintained abroad, agreements that governments will not use their nationalized industries to pour foreign products into our country to the great detriment of our own labor and industries.

Another matter of great concern is the question of protecting certain key industries in the United States which have made it possible for this country to wage two successful wars. Tariffs should not be lowered on the products of these key industries, as they are indispensable to our national existence and our very life.

Most of these industries are highly specialized and require the highest type of both skilled and unskilled workers. Labor costs are one of the most important factors, and we must not subject these industries to foreign competition that would render them impotent. While at the present time labor and industry seem to be far apart on many of their problems, their interests dovetail on tariffs, and many labor unions throughout the United States have joined in the protest against the lowering of tariff rates and have filled briefs with the Reciprocity Information Committee. One prominent union, representing thousands of workers, stated in its protest:

We are not opposed to imports even though those which are competitive with the products of our own American workers. We are opposed to the entry into America's market of competitive articles, delivered at total wholesale costs, duties paid, which are less than our costs of production.

We do not seek any monopoly. However, we will not knowingly or willingly permit any Government officials to deprive us of our work opportunities, and make us dependent on either the charity of the Government, our relatives, or our friends in order to satisfy the theories of some or to add to the riches of others.

We contend that with the changed conditions which now exist in Germany, Japan, Czechoslovakia, and other foreign countries, which in former years were the major source of supplies for American distributors of foreign hand-made glassware articles, there is no definite way at this time of knowing what the production costs of competitive hand-made glassware articles is or will be in the immediate future in those countries.

In addition, it is of interest to have in mind that millions of dollars worth of the latest American automatic machinery has been installed in these foreign countries, at little or no cost to the operators of such machinery and that their future costs of production will soon be much lower than it has been in former years.

One does not have to be equipped with a college training or recognition as an economist to realize that tariff rates which permit of competitive foreign-made products being delivered into America's market at less than American costs of production would soon result in the closing down of America's factories and unemployment for those American workers dependent upon such factories and workshops for their livelihood.

On the other hand, the American Tariff League which represents several hundred industries was very fair in its brief filed with the committee which stated:

Currently the world's economy is chaotic. The United States is at present engaged, as are other countries, in endeavoring to catch up with a demand for goods created by war-time shortages. We do not have any general surplus for export and it will take considerable time to reconstruct and improve our domestic facilities to meet domestic needs and create an exportable surplus. During this chaotic period, we respectfully submit, it is unwise to complicate the situation still further by a mass revision of our tariff.

Indeed the league believes it is unfair at this particular time to expect domestic producers to furnish to the Committee for Reciprocity Information the kind of statistical and informational material which the Committee ought to have in its work of correlating information about domestic production, imports, foreign costs, etc.

It is quite apparent that Congress should adopt a definite policy in connection with reciprocal trade agreements. It should:

First. Pass a resolution calling for a delay of at least 6 months before any new treaties are entered into, during which time a further study of world conditions could be made.

Second. Pass suitable legislation protecting the key industries of the United States which have helped win two wars.

Third. Provide that treaties would not be extended under the favored-nation clause unless all of the nations that would benefit from such an extension would agree to increase wage rates so that the commodities produced in the foreign countries would be on an equal basis with the commodities produced in this country. A study should be made to determine how far the foreign countries with whom we are to negotiate treaties are going in the nationalization of industries and ascertain the effect that such nationalization will have on the treaties to be executed.

I am including a memorandum entitled "History of Scientific Glassware in America" which, I think, is pertinent to this subject:

HISTORY OF SCIENTIFIC GLASSWARE IN AMERICA

At the time of the Allied embargo in 1914, the manufacturing of scientific glassware in this country was negligible, being limited to small shops working largely on repairs or filling shortages of import orders. Along with certain chemicals, drugs, dyes, and optical glassware, laboratory glassware had, up to this time, been a complete German monopoly.

Unlike the other industries mentioned, for some reason the German firms did not see fit to even establish an American subsidiary for making scientific apparatus. As a result, when the blockade became effective and imports were shut off, there was, in England and America, a real crisis.

England immediately called together her glass manufacturers and scientists and, in addition to establishing and subsidizing a school of glass technology, she placed all scientific glassware under the safeguarding of Key Industries Act.

Late in the spring of 1917 the Council of National Defense called together in Washington a group of American glass manufacturers and from that meeting a new American industry was born.

No promises were extracted, but each plant took upon itself the development of suitable glasses, the training of men, and the necessary capital that was required to meet what would otherwise have been a serious situation, not only to our War Department, but to every major supporting industry requiring the smallest degree of scientific research or control.

At the signing of the armistice, there were at least 15 factories producing blown chemical ware and double that number fabricating and graduating laboratory apparatus.

Early in 1919, before central Europe was in a position to enter the American market, there was a flood of Japanese glassware, which demoralized the entire market. This was so serious that in June 1919, this industry, the importance of which was still fresh in the minds of both our Government officials and scientists, was picked out as one of the few industries that should come under the administration's emergency tariff consideration.

In spite of the Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930, the industry was carried on by a decreasing

number of plants, who practically subsidized these departments. Until June of 1933, previous to the devaluation of the dollar, imports from Germany, Czechoslovakia, Italy, and Japan were seriously curtailing the American production of this small but important industry.

This industry is highly specialized and requires the highest type of both skilled and unskilled workers and this branch of the glass industry is still considered by the War Department and Public Health Service as one of the critical industries, the supply of which must be assured.

Because it is an industry whose labor cost is the important factor, the controlling element of foreign competition is, therefore, the standard of wages paid in these countries, further amplified by the unstable currency condition in both Europe and the Orient.

At the outbreak of World War II, this industry was in a position to rapidly expand and furnish the Army and Navy medical services, as well as the Public Health Service, with enormous quantities of items that were required in the war effort. Such production would have been impossible if the industry had not been continued after the First World War, as modern science and medicine are entirely dependent upon scientific apparatus.

Mr. Speaker, I close by repeating that whatever ultimate changes it would seem wise to make in our tariff laws, it is, at the very least, necessary to immediately restore to Congress the veto right over agreements negotiated by the executive department, which may be regarded by the Congress as improvident. Congress has no right, in my judgment, to shirk its responsibility in this regard. My bill will again clothe Congress with the power and responsibility which belongs to it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman ought to be complimented for the very splendid statement he is making this afternoon in calling to the attention of the House and the American people the real danger that lies before us insofar as foreign trade is concerned. While we all agree that we ought to do what we can to rehabilitate Europe, we must defend our own industries from this type of foreign competition, particularly from those totalitarian governments that are being established on the continent of Europe and elsewhere, and who are taking over the industries completely and subsidizing them and then later on, through reciprocal arrangements, are hoping to deluge this country with the cheap products of those countries in competition with our own labor.

Mr. HAND. I am in complete accord with what the gentleman has said, Mr. Speaker, and I know he has in mind, among other things, the very disastrous effects that unwise agreements would have on the great fishing industry which he represents and which to a certain extent I represent, together with shoes and textiles.

I am particularly interested in glass, which is particularly vulnerable in the present state of the law. I think if we restore the situation so that Congress can have the final say, the ultimate veto power, so to speak, on these unwise

agreements that may be negotiated, that that will go a long way to solve the problem.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The Committee on Ways and Means has given serious thought to many of those problems in the continuous hearings they have been holding over a period of days and weeks and will continue for some time to come, and I hope from that there will come some solution along the lines suggested, that others will have something to say other than the executive department of the Government.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman. Both the gentleman and I have testified before the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much confusion and so many misstatements with regard to immigration practices, aliens, and displaced persons, that it is time to have the true picture open for inspection by Members of Congress. The State Department, the Department of Justice, and the well-informed are fully aware of the conspiracy of distortion and misrepresentation which has been launched to confuse the public and bedevil Congress on this subject.

Richard C. Raymond, adviser to the Department of State on displaced persons, recently stated:

We are concerned about a lot of false propaganda that is going around about the displaced persons. There is so much of it that there almost seems to be a campaign behind it.

In the last issue of the Monthly Review of the Immigration and Naturalization Service—March 1947—Commissioner Carusi exposes some of the false stories about immigration in an editorial entitled "Rumor Versus Fact."

Earlier this year Earl Harrison, former Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, said:

Right now, there seems to have been launched a campaign of misrepresentation and distortion concerning immigration into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to disclose and expose this campaign of misrepresentation and to take up point by point each count of this conspiracy of distortion.

Count 1 of the conspiracy consists of the false propaganda that hundreds of thousands, and even millions, of refugees are entering the country illegally. A reputable news magazine recently stated that illegal entries were skyrocketing, that foreigners caught entering the country under false pretenses are now at a rate of 170,000 a year, and it implied that this number consisted entirely of refugees. There have also been newspaper editorials and articles which have been repeated and spread upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the effect that 2,000 aliens enter the country illegally

every day. And here again an attempt is made to convey the thought that these are refugees seeking illegal entry into the United States from European shores. Commissioner Carusi answers this oft-repeated falsehood as follows:

Rumors repeatedly infer that millions of European refugees are crossing our borders illegally. These rumors may stem from the fact that many Mexicans are illegally crossing the southern border of the United States in quest of work. These illegal Mexican entrants are being apprehended and returned to Mexico by the immigration border patrol at the rate of 15,000 per month. If we may judge from protests that we are receiving from the area along the Mexican border, our expulsions of Mexicans are depleting the labor supply to an extent which may exceed the current rate of illegal entries. Be that as it may, these people are neither Europeans nor refugees. Attempted illegal entries from the European area are less than 100 per month; most of these aliens are stowaways who arrive on vessels in groups of from 2 to 10. Practically every one of these stowaways is apprehended by the captain of the vessel before he reaches port and is then turned over to our officers at the pier. They are being returned whence they came by the steamship companies which brought them.

Count 2 of the conspiracy is that all displaced persons of Europe are riffraff and undesirable.

There are approximately 850,000 displaced persons in the various zones in Europe. Of these, more than 50 percent are women and children. There are 150,000 children below the age of 17, and of these 70,000 are estimated to be under 6 years of age. There are 77,000 farm hands among the displaced, some 20,000 housemaids, and 18,000 construction workers. Many are skilled workers, some are professionals, and others are business people. An investigation of these displaced persons, set forth in a House Military Affairs report, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, House Report 2740, states:

The great majority of them are law-abiding and sincerely grateful to the United States.

Count 3 of the conspiracy is the attempt to paint all displaced persons as Communists. Richard C. Raymond, adviser on displaced persons in the State Department, stated in this connection on February 1, 1947, as follows:

A current report stated that there would be many Communists among them and that they would constitute a grave danger. To anyone who has lived among these people and knows them, this is simply not so, for they are thoroughly unsympathetic to communism.

And this is what Commissioner Carusi has to say about the same subject:

As to those having foreign political philosophies the law requires the exclusion on political grounds of persons who are anarchist or who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States, or of all forms of law, or who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government, or who advocate certain specified acts consistent with these prescribed doctrines. Any immigrant who falls within one of these classes is ordered excluded.

In passing I ask: Could it be that the charges of the professional alarmists

against more liberal immigration and the admission of the displaced are inspired by the Communists themselves? They want the displaced turned over to Russia and Russian-dominated countries. They would like to see the failure of the President's program for the displaced of Europe. Members of Congress owe it to themselves to ascertain the sources of these falsely inspired rumors. Let us not have the immigration question confused and divided by the Communists. Let all those who repeat these false charges pay heed lest they innocently front for the Communist Party-line on the refugee problem.

These displaced persons prized freedom deeply enough to have suffered for it. They are presently in detention camps because they refuse to return to Communist-dominated lands and to countries where growing racial and political persecution has taken hold. They are today resisting as they have in the past all forms of totalitarianism. Our democratic way of life was born on European shores among oppressed displaced people and was first brought here on the *Mayflower*. Today's displaced people of Europe are worthy successors to the Pilgrims.

Count 4 of the conspiracy is the attempt to make a Jewish issue out of the problem of immigration, to convey the thought that most of the displaced persons are Jewish, and to fan the flames of anti-Semitism and racial hatred. This would be despicable even if all the displaced persons of Europe were Jewish, which is not the case. It is even more contemptible because of the attempt to mingle race prejudice with malicious falsehoods. Eighty percent of the displaced persons are of the Catholic and Protestant faith. And religious organizations of these faiths are solidly behind the movement to take our fair share of the displaced persons of Europe. Only 20 percent of the displaced are of the Jewish faith and of these an overwhelming majority desire to emigrate to Palestine, and not to the United States.

On this subject, Commissioner Carusi says:

Other rumors imply that large proportions of those persons who are admitted to the United States are of one faith * * *. A preponderance of immigrants from any one religious faith is a matter of chance influenced by economic or other factors which may persuade particular groups to migrate to the United States at any given time. Such a preponderance, if it occurs, is not a violation of law nor does any alien's religious affiliation bear upon his admissibility into this country.

Count 5 of the conspiracy is the attempt to disparage refugees who are lawfully in the United States and to describe them as criminals and Communists. The short answer to that is the statement of J. Edgar Hoover, made during the war years. He stated that "the experience of the FBI in coping with foreign agents, spies, and saboteurs has conclusively illustrated that the great mass of aliens are loyal to the United States, devoted to the principles of democracy." And all those who have ever made any studies on the subject of immigration and crime have concluded that the over-

whelming majority of aliens in the United States are law abiding.

Count 6 of the conspiracy is the double barreled falsehood that there are a million veterans unemployed and that the immigration of displaced persons will result in aggravating this unemployment problem. It is true that more than a million veterans were drawing veteran's unemployment compensation. On the other hand statistics show that not more than 80,000 drew benefits for any sustained period. At the same time, Department of Labor statistics disclosed that there were critical manpower shortages in agricultural workers, certain types of medical personnel, construction workers, and domestics. It is an economic fact fully supported in a recent booklet entitled *Economic Aspects of Immigration* published by the National Committee on Immigration Policy, that immigrants do not take jobs away from veterans or other Americans.

The bulk of the displaced persons are workers. As I previously stated, there are some 77,000 farm hands among them; some 20,000 are housemaids. Many are skilled workers; some are professionals; others still are business people. There is a great shortage of farm labor and domestic service in the United States. New immigrants who are not workers tend to open noncompetitive business shops. A recent study in a metropolitan city showed that each refugee entrepreneur in business created a job for seven Americans. The largest labor unions in our country, the CIO and the A. F. of L. representing over 13,000,000 workers, are on record as favoring the admission of displaced persons. As stated in recent testimony by a Department of Justice representative, "a great number of immigrants, both quota and nonquota, are not within the competitive field of employment." Many of the displaced are women and children. The small number admitted in proportion to our total population cannot create a serious unemployment problem and it should be remembered that all immigrants are consumers.

Count 7 of the conspiracy is the inspired falsification that a regular swarm of persons from Europe has been and is now coming into this country. It has been said that the present influx is seven times the immigration rate during the depression years of the early thirties, and greater than any year since 1929. What are the facts?

In 1929 the United States Congress passed immigration laws permitting 153,000 quota immigrants to enter the country annually. During the war years, from 1940 to 1946 only 15 percent of the total world quota was used. Nine hundred and fourteen thousand seven hundred and sixty-two people who could have entered the United States legally under quotas did not do so. In the fiscal year ended 1946 only 29,095 quota immigrants entered. Is this greater than the number who entered any year since 1929 or during the depression years of the early thirties? I merely call your attention to the fact that in 1930, 141,497 quota immigrants entered the United States and in each of the five additional years the admissions have exceeded the

number who entered during the last fiscal year 1946.

These are the major counts of the conspiracy which has taken shape to distort and confuse the picture of immigration and displaced persons. It is interesting to observe that many of those who have been misled are the first to cry for the expenditure of moneys to investigate rumors they helped spread when by mere contact with administrative officials the true facts can be ascertained.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we should do something about the displaced persons of Europe. Our program should be guided by full knowledge of the facts and not by blind prejudice, false rumors or propaganda which seeks to hinder and obstruct action by the United States.

H. R. 2910, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois on April 1, 1947, authorizes the admission to the United States of 100,000 displaced persons in each of four emergency years. It will, if enacted into law, recapture only in part the unused war quotas. The principal of this bill has been endorsed by more than 100 separate organizations. Religious groups, labor and civic organizations, and some veteran groups, have all gone on record as favoring the admission of our fair share of the displaced persons of Europe.

In conclusion, I call attention to Barry Bingham's keen analysis of the displaced persons problem in the *Courier Journal* of Louisville, Ky. We might well weigh these words:

There are four courses which America might pursue in dealing with this human problem. One is to let the DP's stay forever in former concentration camps, at a cost of \$300,000,000 a year to the American taxpayer. Another is to abandon them and let them starve. A third is to try to force them on other countries, while insisting that we ourselves can give shelter to none of them in the United States. The fourth is to take the lead in distributing them among various nations by offering to take a limited number into this country.

The first two solutions seem out of the question, as too expensive and too brutal. The third is the course we have been tacitly following, though we have never officially adopted it and it is not sanctioned by any of our responsible leaders. It has produced no results to date, for almost none of the DP's have been resettled in new countries.

The fourth solution has both logic and humanity on its side, but unfortunately creates an emotional block in many American minds. The Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons has proposed admitting 400,000, more than half of whom are women and children under 18.

Mr. Speaker, there are eminently practical reasons for America to take the lead in placing the displaced persons. General McNarney, the commanding general of our military forces in Europe, has said that our occupation troops in Germany could be cut sharply if the DP's were moved out of the country. At present they are a dead expense on our hands.

The moral reasons for coming to their rescue hardly need recital. One of the proudest of American traditions lies in the fact that this country gave harbor to the victims of religious and political persecution. The Pilgrim Fathers came to our shores for those very reasons. The

same impetus sent thousands of German families to American shores after the revolution of 1848, and our country has had few more useful citizens. America was built by refugees from foreign lands. Is it any wonder that the world looks to us today for an act of leadership?

I commend to your attention H. R. 2910, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON]. This bill would permit the admission into this country of 100,000 DP's in each of four emergency years. It deserves your support and I trust that the Members will support it, both in committee and on the floor.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 736. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 30, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

611. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the effective operation and expansion of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

612. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize leases on real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other reasons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

613. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$140,000 for the legislative branch, House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 224); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

614. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$21,500 for the legislative branch, Office of Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 225); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

615. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1947 amounting to \$466,000 (H. Doc. No. 226); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

616. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 and prior years in the amount of \$95,089.24, and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$259,500 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 227); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

617. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

618. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 4, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Parkers Creek, Calvert County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

619. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 4, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Petoskey Harbor, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

620. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 12, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Danvers River, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 13, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

621. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 6, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Big Kingston Creek, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

622. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 3, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Bear Creek and Lynch Cove, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3245. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 200. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3203, a bill relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 324). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 183. Resolution to provide for a Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives; with amendments (Rept. No. 325). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 3245. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 3246. A bill to modify the requirements relating to life-saving appliances on passenger vessels navigating the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3247. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 3248. A bill to discontinue in effect certain war excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 3249. A bill to provide for a statutory award of 10 percent to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 3250. A bill to provide for the full and effective utilization of the personnel of the Panama Canal, Canal Zone, and Panama Railroad Company without discrimination; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3251. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3252. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3253. A bill to authorize the allowance of leave credit to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Reserve components thereof who were denied such credit as the result of certain changes in their status between September 8, 1939, and August 9, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3254. A bill to provide additional inducements to physicians and surgeons to make a career of the United States naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 3255. A bill to provide for preferences under the immigration quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3256. A bill to provide for a Resident Commissioner to the United States from the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3257. A bill to create a National Cancer Research Commission in order to provide for and coordinate research in an endeavor to discover the cause or causes of cancer and means for its prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3258. A bill to provide that rentals from certain temporary housing projects shall accrue to the educational institution or State or political subdivision thereof charged with the maintenance of such housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARY:

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that Congress shall fill any vacancy occurring in the office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to authorize conversion of Federal savings and loan associations into State savings and loan or building and loan associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make 1948 appropriations for flood-control projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXI, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 3259. A bill for the relief of Tsuyoshi Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 3260. A bill for the relief of Clarence S. Osika; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 3261. A bill for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3262. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Maloy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3263. A bill for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

394. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Ora L. Leslie and 49 other residents of

Beloit, Kans., and vicinity, urging the enactment of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

395. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, concerning unemployment compensation and employment service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

396. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, concerning legislation to place residents of the non-community-property States on a parity with those of community-property States with respect to Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

397. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, concerning amendment to the provisions of the Federal income-tax law to permit deductions of amounts expended in connection with the research and development of new products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

398. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, concerning enactment of legislation providing for conservation payments for the benefit of stripper wells, thereby preventing the premature abandonment thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

399. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Wisconsin Society of Certified Public Accountants adopted at a meeting of the board of directors on April 21, 1947, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation to end income-tax burden of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

400. Also, Joint Resolution 32A of the State of Wisconsin, petitioning the Congress to amend the social-security law relative to persons in public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

401. Also, Joint Resolution 31A of the State of Wisconsin, relating to petitioning Congress to raise the amount of personal exemptions on Federal taxation of incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

402. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of Malden Townsend Club, No. 1, Malden, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

403. Also, petition of Local 166, United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America (CIO), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for investigation of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.'s behavior during strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

404. Also, petition of the Council of the City of Toledo, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging Congress not to pass legislation which is unnecessarily repressive to either labor or management; to the Committee on Education and Labor.